



# TABAQĀT-I-AKBARĪ

## ENGLISH TRANSLATION

(VOLUME III—*contd.*)

### SECTION VIII. <sup>1</sup> THE SECTION ABOUT THE SULTĀNS OF MĀLWA.

From the year 807 A.H. to the year 970 A.H., which is a period of one hundred and sixty-three years, there were eleven persons, who either themselves or through their deputies governed Mālwa.

<sup>2</sup> Dilāwar Khān Ghūrī, 20 years;

Sultān Hūshang, son of Dilāwar Khān, 30 years;

Sultān Maḥmūd, son of Sultān Hūshang, one year and a few months;

Sultān Maḥmūd Khālji, 34 years;

Sultān Ghiyāth-ud-dīn, son of Sultān Maḥmūd, 20 years;

Sultān Nāṣir-ud-dīn, son of Ghiyāth-ud-dīn, 11 years and 4 months;

Sultān Maḥmūd, son of Nāṣir-ud-dīn, 20 years and six months and eleven days;

Sultān Bahādūr Gujrātī, 16 years;

Mallū Qādir Shāh, 6 years;

Shūjā' Khān, as Nāib of Shēr Khān Afghān, 12 years;

Bāz Bahādūr Afghān, 16 years.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Section about Mālwa is the heading used by the late Mr. B. De in his notes, but the editor has followed the text-edition in which M. Hidayat Ḥosain has طبقة سلاطين مالوة. Regarding the sequence of various sections see note 2, page 414.

<sup>2</sup> There are some variations and omissions in the lists in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. I have tried to get a correct list after comparing them.

<sup>1</sup> It should not remain concealed that the country of Mālwa is an extensive territory. Great rulers have always <sup>2</sup> been (reigned) in that country. Great Rājas and renowned Rāys like <sup>3</sup> Rāja Bikramājī from the commencement of whose reign the Hindū era begins, and Rāja Bhōj and others, who were among the Rājas of Hindūstān, <sup>4</sup> possessed great renown, by their rule of Mālwa. Islām first <sup>5</sup> appeared in that country from the time of Sultān Maḥmūd Ghaznavī. Among the Sultāns of Dehli Sultān Ghiyāth-ud-dīn Balban acquired dominion over it; and after him till the time of Sultān <sup>6</sup> Firūz Shāh it was in the possession of the Sultāns of Dehli.

Dilāwar Khān Ghūrī attained to the rule of the country from a time before the reign of <sup>7</sup> Sultān Muḥammad, the son of Firūz, and

<sup>1</sup> Firishtah copies the Ṭabaqāt in this place almost *verbatim*; but as regards Islām, he says بعد از زمان سلطان محمود غزنوی که اسلام در هندوستان شائع شد. This is different from what is stated in the text, and is more correct historically. Islām certainly did not become known in Mālwa from the time of Sultān Maḥmūd. Of course if the expression در آن بلاد refers to Hindūstān and not to Mālwa, then there is nothing wrong with the text.

<sup>2</sup> One MS. and the lith. ed. have می بوده اند, but the other MS. می بودند.

<sup>3</sup> One MS. omits the word Rāja. Bikramājī is of course a variant of the Vikramāditya. The era which dates from his accession commences 56 years before Christ.

<sup>4</sup> The MSS. have داشته اند, داشته, and the lith. ed. has داشتند.

<sup>5</sup> One MS. has پیدا شد, while the other has simply شد, and the lith. ed. has پیدا شده گرفت. The reading of the second manuscript has been followed by M. Hidayat Ḥosain in the text-edition.

<sup>6</sup> One MS. and the lith. ed. have Sultān Firūz Shāh, but the other MS. has Sultān Muḥammad Firūz Shāh. Firishtah lith. ed. in the corresponding passage has Sultān Muḥammad, son of Firūz Shāh. This last statement is correct. The conquest of Mālwa took place in the reign of Sultān Ghiyāth-ud-dīn Balban in 710 A.H., 1316 A.D.; and it became independent in the reign of Muḥammad, the son of Firūz Tughlaq, 789 A.H., 1389 A.D. The Cambridge History of India, page 349, says, that the date of Dilāwar Khān Ghūrī's appointment as governor is not precisely known; but he was certainly in Mālwa in 1392, and he was probably appointed by Firūz Shāh of Dehli who died in 1388. M. Hidayat Ḥosain has سلطان محمد فیروز شاه in the text-edition.

<sup>7</sup> One MS. and the lith. ed. have Sultān Maḥmūd, while the other has Sultān Muḥammad, son of Firūz.

declared his independence. From that time the rulers of Mālwa ceased to own allegiance to the Sultān of Delhi; and eleven persons<sup>1</sup> ruled one after another till the time of His Majesty the Khālifa-i-Hāhī. The section about Mālwa, therefore, begins from the time of Dillāwar Khān Ghūrī. They say that Sultān Muḥammad son of Firūz Shāh<sup>2</sup> granted favours to a body of men, who had accompanied him during his earlier expeditions; and had shown loyalty and sincerity. When he<sup>3</sup> became Sultān he conferred four countries on four of them; and each of these four attained to sovereign power. (He) sent Zafar Khān, the son of Waḥīd-ul-mulk to Gujrat, Khidr Khān to Multān and Dihlīpūr, Khwājah Sarwar Khwājah Jahān, to whom he granted the title of<sup>4</sup> Malik-ud-dharrq, to Jaunpūr, and Dillāwar Khān Ghūrī to Mālwa.

#### <sup>5</sup> AN ACCOUNT OF DILLĀWAR KHĀN GHŪRĪ.

As in the year<sup>6</sup> 800 A.D., Dillāwar Khān came to Mālwa, he brought the country into his possession, by the strength of his brave

<sup>1</sup> One MS. and the 11th. ed. have حکومت کردند, but the other MS. has حکومت کرد; the latter has been followed in the text-edition.

<sup>2</sup> One MS. omits the words حکم را چار کس را چار ملک کرد; - ۸۰۰ و ۸۰۰ چار کس را چار ملک کرد.

<sup>3</sup> One MS. has رسید, another رسید; while the 11th. ed. has رسید.

<sup>4</sup> M. Hidayat Husain has ملک الشوری instead of ملک الشوری in the text-edition.

<sup>5</sup> Fiehlidat's account agrees but he mentions in addition, that Dillāwar Khān's first capital was at Dihlī but as he intended to make Bhādnābād Mandī his capital, he went there from time to time and endeavoured to build it. He also says that when Bulṭān Muḥmūd of Delhi, fleeing from Tīmūr came to Gujrat in 801 A.D., and as he was not received with due honour by Muḥammad Shāh, he came to Mālwa and was welcomed with great honour by Dillāwar Khān. He remained in Dihlī till 804 A.D. Alp Khān, Dillāwar Khān's son, was not pleased with the latter for the welcome given to Bulṭān Muḥmūd and retired with most of the soldiers to Mandī, where he built a very strong fort in the course of three years. In 804 A.D., Bulṭān Muḥmūd returned towards Delhi.

<sup>6</sup> The year is ۸۰۰ هـ و ۸۰۰ A.D. in the MS., as well as in the 11th. ed., and the year of his death ۸۲۰ هـ و ۸۲۰ A.D. in the MS., and in the 11th. ed. These dates are incorrect according to Fiehlidat. According to him, his rule commenced in the year ۸۰۴ هـ و ۸۰۴ A.D., which is



## AN ACCOUNT OF SULTĀN HŪSHANG, SON OF DILĀWAR KHĀN.

Alp Khān, who was the son of Dilāwar Khān, became the successor of the latter, and had the public prayer (*Khuṭbā*) read in his name and the coin struck in his name. He raised the royal umbrella over his head and gave himself the title of Sulṭān Hūshang. The *amīrs* and the great men of that country rendered homage to him.

The affairs of the kingdom, and the foundations of power had not yet been firmly fixed, when scouts brought the news, that Sulṭān Muẓaffar Gujrātī had arrived at Ujjain: and \* information had reached

also incorrect. The correct date is 789 A.H., 1387 A.D. The correct year of his death is 808 A.H., 1405 A.D. The Cambridge History of India, page 349, gives 1406 as the year of Dilāwar Khān's death.

<sup>1</sup> One MS. and the text-edition have Sulṭān Muḥammad, which is incorrect. See page 290 of vol. I of the translation.

<sup>2</sup> The Cambridge History of India, page 349, says, "Dilāwar Khān never assumed the style of royalty." This is not correct: according either of the *Ṭabaqāt* or *Firishtah*. The latter is even more particular than the *Ṭabaqāt*. He says:

دعوت استقلال کرد بطریق سلاطین خطبہ مالوہ بنام خود کردہ جترو سراپردہ  
سرخ ساخت -

<sup>3</sup> The Cambridge History of India, page 349, says definitely Alp Khān "removed his father by poison". Neither the *Ṭabaqāt* nor *Firishtah* says so positively. See note 3, page 185.

<sup>4</sup> The words *باو خبر رسید* occur only in one MS. but neither in the other MS. nor in the lith. ed.

him that Alp Khān had, <sup>1</sup>for the sake of worldly power, administered poison to Dilāwar Khān; and had given himself the name of Hūshang Shāh. As there had been a bond of brotherly feelings between Dilāwar Khān and Sultān Muẓaffar, (the latter) <sup>2</sup> had equipped an army, and was marching to Mālwa. In the beginning of the year 810 A.H., Sultān Muẓaffar encamped in the vicinity of Dhār. Sultān Hūshang came out of the fort, with the determination to give battle; and <sup>3</sup> the two armies engaged each other. In the end Hūshang fled, and took shelter in the fort. As he found that he did not possess the power to withstand (Sultān) Muẓaffar, he prayed for quarter; and came and waited on the Sultān. In the same *majlis* he and his nobles were placed under arrest, and made over to custodians. The Sultān then left his own brother <sup>4</sup> Naṣir Khān, with a large force, in the fort of Dhār; and himself returned with victory and triumph to Gujrāt.

As Naṣir Khān, who was without any experience, in the very first year demanded from the *ra'iyyats* rents which were beyond their power to pay, and otherwise ill-treated them. The Mālwa army seizing the opportunity after the departure of Sultān Muẓaffar had carried him out of Dhār by <sup>5</sup> Khwājahdārs, and pursuing him caused injury

<sup>1</sup> The words *بواسطة حکام دنیوی* occur in one MS. and in the lith. ed., but not in the other MS.

<sup>2</sup> The Cambridge History of India, page 349, says that the "avenging the death of his old friend" was merely a "pretext" for Muẓaffar's invasion of Mālwa.

<sup>3</sup> Firishtah says that Muẓaffar was wounded, and Hūshang was thrown from his horse; but they went on fighting, but victory or defeat does not depend on one's exertions, and victory was allotted to Sultān Muẓaffar from the supernatural world.

<sup>4</sup> He is called *ناصر خان* Naṣir Khān in the MSS. and in the lith. ed., except in one place in the latter where he is called *ناصرت خان* Naṣir Khān and Nuṣrat Khān. Firishtah lith. ed. calls him Nuṣrat Khān, and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 172) Noosrut Khan and in the Cambridge History of India, page 349, Nusrat Khān. He was called Naṣrat Khān in the History of Gujrāt (see p. 186 and also note 1 on the same page).

<sup>5</sup> The construction of the sentence is not very clear. The corresponding passage in the history of Sultān Muẓaffar Gujrātī was *اورا خواجہ دار از دھار* و اورا خواجہ دار از دھار بر اورده راء گجرات نمودند (text-edition p. 94). There I thought that the *Khwājahdār* was some kind of a palace official, who took him out of Dhār and showed him the way to Gujrāt. Probably the word *Khwājahdār* here also has the same significance.

to such of his followers as fell behind. They left Dhār for fear of Sultān Muẓaffār, erected buildings in the fort of Mandū, the strong bastions of which <sup>1</sup> claimed rivalry with the celestial <sup>2</sup> girdle or the Zodiac (and took up their residence there); and made Mūsa Khān, who was a cousin, uncle's son, of Sultān Hūshang, their chief. After this news had reached Gujrāt, Hūshang Shāh sent a petition to Sultān Muẓaffār to the effect, "That the lord and master of the people of the world was in the place of this *faqīr's* father and uncle, and the words which certain self-interested people had spoken to him were, the great God knows, contrary to the truth. At this time it was being reported that the noblemen of Mālwa had acted with disrespect to Khān-i-Ā'zam <sup>3</sup> Naṣīr Khān; had made Mūsa Khān their leader and had taken possession of the country. If this *faqīr* was lifted up from the dust, and was placed in the bonds of gratitude, it was possible that the country should again come into his possession."

<sup>4</sup> Sultān Muẓaffār having approved of this proposal, released him, after he had been in prison for one year, and began to show favours to him. He took engagements from him, and after arranging his affairs, granted permission to Shāhzāda Aḥmad Shāh, in the year 821 A.H., to proceed to help and reinforce him; so that he might recover possession of Dhār and the neighbouring country from the <sup>5</sup> rebellious *amīrs*, and make it over to him. Aḥmad Shāh recovered the country from the *amīrs*, and made it over to him, and then returned to the capital city of Pattan.

After Sultān Hūshang had been in Dhār for some days, and a body of his special guards had collected round him, he sent a man to the fort of Mandū, and giving assurances of favour to the *amīrs*, summoned

<sup>1</sup> One MS. and the lith. ed. have لاف برتری زد while the other MS. has لاف برابری زد; M. Hidayat Ḥosain has adopted the former in the text-edition.

<sup>2</sup> One MS. and the lith. ed. have منطقة البروج, but the other MS. has منطقة العين.

<sup>3</sup> The name is نصرت خان Naṣrat Khān, here in one MS. and in the lith. ed., but in the other MS. it is نصیر خان Naṣīr Khān. I have kept Naṣīr Khān, as he has been so named in the earlier parts of this section.

<sup>4</sup> Firishtah agrees. The Cambridge History of India, page 349, says that Hūshang swore "on the Koran that he was guiltless of his father's death".

<sup>5</sup> One MS. omits the words from غدار to از تصرف امراء.

them to his side. The *amīrs* and the soldiers were anxious to join him, and were all pleased and delighted; but as they had taken their wives and children with them to the fort of Mandū, <sup>1</sup> they could not join his service. Hūshang went with a small force to the town of <sup>2</sup> Mahēsar, and every day his men went forward to fight, but were wounded, and had to come back. As the fort of Mandū was very strong, Hūshang Shāh considered it advisable, that he should march away from that place, and take up a position in the centre of the town; and sending his men to the different towns and *parganas*, take possession of them. About this time, Malik Mughlīth, who was the son of the aunt of Sultān Hūshang, had a consultation with Malik Khidr who was celebrated as <sup>3</sup> Miyān Aghā and said, "Although Mūsa Khān is a young man of good breeding, and is a son of one of our aunts, yet Hūshang Shāh surpasses all his evils in manliness and intelligence and wisdom and patience; and this kingdom belongs to him by inheritance as well as acquisition; and besides in his childhood, he was brought up in the loving arms of my mother. It is advisable, therefore, that the reins of this government and rule should be placed in the grasp of his power." Miyān Aghā praised the decision of Malik Mughlīth; and they in concert came out one night from the fort of Mandū, and joined Sultān Hūshang. The latter gave Malik Mughlīth a promise of being made his deputy; and this gave the latter great pleasure and delight.

Mūsa Khān on hearing this news cut the thread of hope by the scissors of despair; and became anxious about his safety. In the end, he sent a messenger to Malik Mughlīth, with the request, that a place

<sup>1</sup> No reason is given for this in the text or in Firishtah lith. ed.; but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 173) says, they were unwilling to abandon their families; and the Cambridge History of India, page 350, says, "As their wives and families would be left exposed to Mūsā's wrath".

<sup>2</sup> The name is مهسار Mahēsar in one MS., and also in the other, but is partly obliterated in it. It is بهر in the lith. ed. and مهر in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. The Cambridge History of India, page 350, says that Hūshang marched to Māndū.

<sup>3</sup> The nickname looks like میان انا in the MS. and in the lith. ed. In the lith. ed. of Firishtah it is Miyān Khān and Miyān Aghā in different places. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 174) calls him Meean Agha. The name is not given in the Cambridge History of India. میان آخا in the text-edition.

might be allotted to him for his residence, so that he might surrender the fort of Mandū. After much discussion, a place was fixed for him; and he evacuated the fort and went away. Sultān Hūshang entered the fort of Mandū, and took up his abode in his capital. He conferred the title of Malik-ush-sharq on and entrusted the duties of the *vazīrat* to Malik Mughlīth, and in all matters made him his deputy and representative.

In the year 813 A.H., 1410 A.D., Sultān Muẓaffar Gujrāti accepted the summons of God; and the government of the empire devolved upon Sultān Aḥmad, the son of Muḥammad Shāh the son of Sultān Muẓaffar. Firūz Khān and Haibat Khān, sons of Sultān Muẓaffar raised the standard of revolt and hostility in the country of Bahrōj, and asked for help from Hūshang. The latter returning the rights acquired by Muẓaffar Shāh by the support he had given to him, and the aid given to him by Aḥmad Shāh, by enmity, turned towards the country of Gujrāt; and his ancient grudge induced him to advance into that country, and to destroy the rules of the government. Sultān Aḥmad advanced with a large army, and besieged Bahrōj immediately, on hearing the news. Firūz Khān and Haibat Khān, frightened by the <sup>1</sup> grandeur and power and awed by the immense number of Aḥmad Shāh's troops, prayed for protection, and joined the latter. Hūshang turned back from the way, and returned to Dhār. The narrative of these transactions has been written in detail in the section about Gujrāt.

The sweats of shame and repentance had not yet dried up on the forehead of Hūshang, when he again attempted the same kind of nefarious deeds. For when in the year 816 A.H., 1413 A.D., he heard that Sultān Aḥmad Gujrāti had advanced to attack the <sup>2</sup> Rāja of Jhālāwār, and was compelled to remain there, he at once collected his troops, and turned towards the country of Gujrāt. Sultān Aḥmad,

<sup>1</sup> The readings in the MSS. are *از خوف سطوت و استیلاء و مهبت و کثرت سپاه*. The lith. ed. omits the two *و* before *مهبت* and *کثرت*. I have adopted the readings in the MSS., though I think that it would be better to omit the *و* before *کثرت*.

<sup>2</sup> Firishtah agrees with the *Ṭabaqūt* about Hūshang's first and second inroads into Gujrāt. As to the second, he calls the Rāja the Rāja of Jālūwāra instead of that of Jhālāwār.

immediately on receiving this news, advanced to attack and destroy him. When they approached each other, and Hūshang got no help from the Rāja of Jhālāwār, he had no alternative left, and returned to his own country.

After his return petitions from the *zamīndars* of Gujrāt, and specially from the Rājas of Chāmpānīr, Nādōt and Īdar came one after another to him, to the effect, that on the first occasion there had been neglect and dilatoriness in their service to him, but this time there will be no minutia left in their loyal devotion in his service. If the Sultān would turn towards Gujrāt, they <sup>1</sup> would send some guides to attend on him; and they would guide his army along a road in such a way, that Sultān Aḥmad would not know anything about his advance, up to the time of his arrival in the country of Gujrāt. The indignity (of his repeated failures) being added to his former enmity induced <sup>2</sup> Sultān Hūshang again to collect his troops and advance into Gujrāt. In order to carry out this intention, he advanced in the year 821 A.H., 1418 A.D., with great pomp by way of Mahrāsa. It so happened, that at that time, Sultān Aḥmād was in the neighbourhood of Sultānpūr and Nadarbār, attending to some matters connected with the government. When the news of Hūshang's advance reached him, he considered that the extinguishing of the flame of the disturbance created by Hūshang should have precedence over all other matters; and he advanced to Mahrāsa with speed; and in spite of heavy rains he arrived there in a short time. When the spies of Sultān Hūshang gave him information of the arrival of Sultān Aḥmad, he was in great anxiety; and sent for the *zamīndārs*, who by sending their petitions had raised the dust of disturbance and rebellion, into his presence; and reproached

---

<sup>1</sup> One MS. and the lith. ed. have فرستیم but the other MS. has فرستم.

<sup>2</sup> As to the third expedition. Firishtah says that the petitions were sent by the Rājas of Jālwāra, of Muḥammadābād Chāmpānīr, of Nādōt and Īdar, and not by the last two only as mentioned in the text. Firishtah also says that Sultān Aḥmad had gone to punish Naṣīr Khān Fārūqī, who with the help of fifteen thousand horsemen sent under Ghaznīn Khān by Sultān Hūshang, was attempting to take away the fort of Thālnīr from his younger brother Malīk Ifīkhār, but on Sultān Aḥmad's arrival at Sultānpūr and Nadarbār, Ghaznīn Khān fled towards Mālwa, and Naṣīr Khān Fārūqī went away towards Asīr. After this when he was at Sultānpūr, Sultān Aḥmad heard of Sultān Hūshang's invasion.

them, and spoke unseemly words to them. In the end he returned scratching the back of his head by the same road by which he had come.

Sulṭān Aḥmad halted at Mahrāsa for some days, so that his army might join him. After the troops <sup>1</sup> had collected he advanced, in the month of Ṣafar, into the country of Mālwa; and by repeated marches arrived at and encamped in the neighbourhood of Kālīādah. Sulṭān Hūshang also advanced a few stages with the intention of engaging him. After the battle he fled and took shelter in the fort of Mandū. Sulṭān Aḥmad's army <sup>2</sup> pursued him up to the gate of Mandū; and seized some of his elephants and soldiers. Sulṭān Aḥmad himself went as far as <sup>3</sup> Na'icha; and, halting there some days, sent detachments in different directions in the country. As the fort of Mandū was very strong, he was obliged to turn his reins towards Dhār. From that place he wanted to go to Ujjain, but as the rains had commenced the *amīrs* and *vazīrs* represented to him, that the welfare of the state demanded that he should return that year to the capital of Gujrāt; and should punish the turbulent men, who had been the cause of the disturbance and rebellion, and teach them a lesson; and in the next year he should, with a mind freed from all anxieties, set about the conquest of Mālwa. Sulṭān Aḥmad agreeing to this proposal returned from Dhār, and cast to the shadow of his favour on the people of Gujrāt.

In the year 822 A.H., 1417 A.D., Sulṭān Hūshang conferred the title of Maḥmūd Khān on Malik Maḥmūd, the son of Malik Muḡthī, on whose clear forehead the signs of nobility and knowledge of affairs were patent and bright; and made him <sup>4</sup> the partner of his father in <sup>5</sup> the administration of the government. Whenever he went anywhere, he left Malik Muḡthī in the fort of Mandū, and took Maḥmūd Khān with him, so that he might attend to the affairs of state.

<sup>1</sup> One MS. has by mistake *مقتل* instead of *جند*.

<sup>2</sup> One MS. has by mistake *توقف* instead of *تدب*.

<sup>3</sup> Firūzshāh in his account of this expedition has instead of Na'icha Zafarshāh only Na'icha. Otherwise his account agrees with that in the text.

<sup>4</sup> The words *بدر* are omitted in one MS.

<sup>5</sup> The MSS. have *بدر*, and *بدر*, and the lith. ed. has *بدر*. M. Hidayat Husain has followed the lith. ed. in the text-edition.

<sup>1</sup> In the year 825 A.H., 1421 A.D., Sultān Hūshang selected one thousand horsemen out of his army; and in the garb of merchants advanced towards Jājnagar. He took some <sup>2</sup> silver gray and iron

<sup>1</sup> Before describing Sultān Hūshang's expedition to Jājnagar, Firishtah says, that Sultān Aḥmad intended to invade and plunder Mālwa, but Sultān Hūshang becoming aware of this, sent eloquent ambassadors with many valuable presents, and Sultān Aḥmad took the presents, and returned to Aḥmadābād. He also says that in 823 A.H., 1420 A.D., Sultān Hūshang attacked the fort of Kehrla which was on the boundary of Berār. Rāy Narsingh, the ruler of Kehrla, met him with fifty thousand horsemen and foot soldiers, and fought a fierce battle, but was defeated and slain. Sultān Hūshang then besieged and took the fort of Sārangadha which belonged to Rāy Narsingh, and took the treasure and 84 great elephants which were in it, and reduced the son of Rāy Narsingh to be a suzerain and tributary to himself.

The following account of Sultān Hūshang's expedition to Jājnagar, compared with the disjointed accounts of it previously given in the history of Aḥmad Shāh of Gujrāt (see pp. 204, 205, and note 2, p. 204), is more connected and consistent; but the expedition itself was curious in various ways. It is clear that merchants used to go from Mālwa and the neighbouring country to Jājnagar or Orissa with horses and other merchandise to barter them for elephants, for the account shows, that it was well known that the Rāy of Jājnagar was fond of horses of particular colour and that his subjects were likely to buy certain merchandise. It is difficult to say whether Hūshang intended to barter his horses and other merchandise for elephants like an honest merchant, or whether he intended from the beginning to plunder the Rāy of Jājnagar of some of his elephants, which at that time were considered to be a valuable instrument of war. Probably he had an undercurrent in his mind for looting the elephants from the beginning.

The account given by Firishtah agrees mainly with that in the text. The account in the Cambridge History of India, pages 350, 351, also agrees, although it calls the Orissa chief, the Rāja of "Jājpur, the capital of Orissa". It will be seen that both the Ṭabaqāt and Firishtah call the place Jājnagar. In the previous incidental reference to this expedition on page 298, the Cambridge History of India, the expedition is designated Sultān Hūshang's "famous raid into Orissa", and no mention is made of either Jājnagar or Jājpur. It will be remembered that Sultān Firūz Shāh had hunted elephants in Jājnagar. There is a Jājpur in Orissa also, which is the headquarters of a civil division in the district of Cuttack, but as far as I know it is not mentioned anywhere in history.

<sup>2</sup> There is some difference in the readings in the description of the horses. The MSS. have اسپان نقره و برخنگ, and اسپان نقره سر ننگ, and the lith. ed. has اسپان نقره سر خنگ. Firishtah in the corresponding passage has اسپان نقره رنگ.



gray horses which the Rāy of Jājnagar was very fond of, and some other kinds of merchandise, which the people of that country took with pleasure. His object in taking this journey was this, that in exchange for the horses, and the other merchandise, he would select some elephants, and take (or buy) them. So that by means of their strength, he should be able to have his revenge against Aḥmad Shāh. When he arrived in the neighbourhood of Jājnagar, he sent a man to the Rāy, and gave him notice that a great merchant had come with the object of buying elephants and had brought with him many <sup>1</sup> silver gray and gray and white horses, and various linen and silk stuffs and <sup>2</sup> *narmīna*. The Rāy enquired, "Why he has encamped at a distance from the city." The man whom Sultān Hūshang had sent replied, "He has many merchants with him and has encamped at a place where he found water and an open plain." The Rāy said, "I shall come to the caravan on such and such a date, let the horses be kept ready for my inspection on that day; and let the linen and silk goods be spread out on the ground, so that after inspecting them, I shall give in exchange for what I buy, elephants, if they want elephants, or money in cash if they want that." When the man who had been sent came back, Sultān Hūshang summoned the trusted men (among his followers) and took new engagements from them, that they should not act contrary to whatever he might order; and waited for the day (named by the Rāy).

When that day came the Rāy sent forty elephants to the caravan, in advance of himself, so that the merchants might please themselves (by inspecting them). He gave them notice that he was coming, and sent a message that they should expose their goods, and keep their horses ready. Sultān Hūshang sent back all the elephants, and spread out a part of the goods on the ground. At this time the Rāy

---

<sup>1</sup> Here the horses are described in one MS. as *نقره و سر خنگ*, and in the other as *نقره و سر حنک*, and in the lith. ed. as *نقره و سر خنگ*. Firishtah has *نقره رنگ و سبز رنگ و کبود*. Col. Briggs (vol. IV. p. 178) has "horses of different colours; viz. bright bay, bright chestnut, and different shades of grey". M. Hidayat Ḥosain has adopted *نقره و سر خنگ* in the text-edition.

<sup>2</sup> The MSS. have *نرمینه* and the lith. ed. has *زعمینه*. I cannot find the meaning of these words. Firishtah has no corresponding word. He has *قماش و عتاق دیگر*. M. Hidayat Ḥosain has only *پارۀ عتاق دیگر* in the text-edition.

came to the caravan with five hundred men and inspected the various goods. As it was the rainy season, <sup>1</sup> a dark cloud appeared, and drops of rain began to fall. The elephants hearing the sound of the thunder and frightened by the lightning began to run away. The goods which was spread out on the ground were spoiled under their feet. At this time a great noise rose from the caravan; and Sultān Hūshang in the manner of a merchant tore handfuls of hair from his head and beard, and said, "My merchandise has been damaged, I do not wish to live." Then with his soldiers he mounted the horses which had been already made ready and attacked the Rāja's troops. At the first onset the latter lost their firm foothold and the rule of their firmness and power was shattered. Some of the men were made food for the sword, and some fled. The Rāy himself was taken prisoner alive.

At this time Sultān Hūshang revealed his identity; and said, "I am Hūshang Shāh Ghūrī. I have come to this country for (obtaining) elephants." The *vazirs* and *amirs* of Jājnagar sent an emissary to wait upon the Sultān with the message, that they were willing to agree to anything which the Sultān might wish. The Sultān sent the reply, "There was no idea of deceit or fraud in the purpose of my coming. I came to buy elephants. My merchandise has been damaged. I have seized the Rāja as a hostage, in exchange of whom I would take elephants." The *vazirs* of Jājnagar sent 75 splendid elephants to him, and also made their excuses. Sultān Hūshang returned towards his own country taking the Rāy with him. When he passed the boundary of the Rāy's territory he comforted him and tried to please his heart, and gave him permission to go back. When the Rāy arrived at his own capital he sent some more elephants to the Sultān.

On the way, information reached the Sultān, that Sultān Aḥmad had again invaded Mālwa and had besieged the fort of Mandū. When he arrived near <sup>2</sup> the fort of Kehrla, he summoned the Rāy of Kehrla,

<sup>1</sup> One MS. has by mistake سیاه برای, instead of سیاه ابری.

<sup>2</sup> See note 1, page 475, from which it will appear that, according to Firishlah, Sultān Hūshang attacked the Rāy of Kehrla before going on expedition to Jājnagar.

placed him in confinement, and took possession of the fort. He then advanced towards Mandū. When he arrived in the neighbourhood of that city, Sultān Aḥmad summoned his *amīrs* and soldiers from the batteries, collected them together and prepared for battle. Sultān Hūshang entered the fort by the Tārāpūr gate and did not prepare for battle. But when Sultān Aḥmad saw that the capture of the fort was difficult, and in fact impossible, he rose from the foot of the fort, and prepared to plunder and devastate the country. He passed by Ujjain, and determined to seize Sārangpūr. Sultān Hūshang on becoming aware of this determination, managed to betake himself to the citadel of Sārangpūr by another route. He then sent a message to Sultān Aḥmad to the following effect; "As the rights of Musalmāns are mixed up in this, and you know <sup>1</sup> yourself that the shedding of the blood of Musalmāns without any reason is fraught with great calamity; and in this case immense herds of them would perish, it is fitting that you should turn the bridle of your determination towards your own capital. <sup>2</sup> The necessary tribute shall be sent soon after".

Sultān Aḥmad's mind becoming composed owing to the (promise of) peace, he evinced negligence and carelessness in the guarding of his troops, and in taking necessary precautions and care. Sultān Hūshang taking advantage of this opportunity made a <sup>3</sup> night attack on the night of the 12th Muḥarram-ul-ḥarām in the year 826 A.H.

<sup>1</sup> The word خود is omitted in one MS.

<sup>2</sup> It is not clear whether this last clause is part of the message. The verb خواهد فرستاد is in the third person, which would indicate that it is not.

<sup>3</sup> For the account of this night attack, as given in the history of the reign of Sultān Aḥmad of Gujrāt, see pages 206, 207, and note 4 on page 206 and notes 1-3 on page 207. The account of the night attack as given here agrees mainly with that given by Firishtah, with the exception that in the text Rāy Sāmat is called the Rāja of Dundāh and the vulgar name of the place is given as Garī. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, pp. 181, 182) gives the 14th (and not the 12th) Mohurum, 826 A.H. (29th December, 1422) as the date of the night attack. Sāmat Rāy is designated Savant Ray, Raja of Dundooka, who was "afterwards known by the name of Kurry Raja". He also says that Ahmud Shah captured "twenty elephants belonging to Sooltan Hooshung besides seven of those he had recently brought from Jajnuggur". The Cambridge History of India passes over the night attack and the subsequent engagement.

Many people perished that night; among them Rāy Sāmat, the Rāy of the country of Dundāh, which now on the tongues and in the mouths of the (people) is called Karī, was slain with five hundred Rājput, in the vicinity of the Sultān's pavilion. Sultān Aḥmad came out of the camp with only one attendant, and stood on the open plain. Towards the morning men gathered round him, and about the time of the true dawn, which indeed was the dawn of the morning of good fortune, the Sultān fell upon Sultān Hūshang's troops, and the battle of bloodshed and slaughter became so severe, that both the *Bādshāhs* received wounds, and in the end Sultān Hūshang fled and took shelter in the citadel of Sārangpūr. Seven of the Jājnagar elephants were seized by Sultān Aḥmad; and on the 4th of Rabi'-ul-ākhir of that year, Sultān Aḥmad turned towards Gujrāt with victory and triumph.

When Hūshang became aware of this he came out of the citadel of Sārangpūr with great pride and audacity and started in pursuit. Sultān Aḥmad turned round and confronted him. The flame of battle blazed up between the two armies, and at the first onset Sultān Hūshang put the army of Gujrāt into confusion. Sultān Aḥmad seeing this himself advanced into the battle-field, and fought so well that the breeze of victory and triumph began to blow upon the plumes of his standards. Hūshang again fled, and took shelter in the fort of Sārangpūr. Then Sultān Aḥmad returned to Gujrāt. It may be said that on the whole Sultān Hūshang was distinguished by bravery and high spirit, but he was not victorious in war; and in most of his battles, after much striving and struggle, he had to flee, and to soil the skirts of his courage with the dust of flight. When authentic information arrived that Sultān Aḥmad had passed over the boundary of Gujrāt, Hūshang went from Sārangpūr to the fort of Mandū. The same year after some days, he repaired the damage sustained by his army, and advanced to conquer the fort of Kākrun; and seized it in the course of a short time. In the same year he again advanced to conquer Gwāliar, and by successive marches, took possession of the neighbouring territory. After a month and some days had passed, Sultān Mubārak Shāh, son of Khizr Khān, marched with an army by way of Biyāna to aid the Rāy of Gwāliar. When this news reached Sultān Hūshang, he raised the siege, and advanced to meet the army

up to the <sup>1</sup> river of Dhōlpūr. After some days a peace was ratified; and it was agreed that Hūshang should give up the idea of conquering Gwāliar. The two parties then sent presents to each other and returned to their respective capitals.

<sup>2</sup> In the year 832 A.H., 1428 A.D., messengers swift-footed like the wind and desert-traversing scouts brought the news that Sultān Aḥmad Shāh Bahmanī, the ruler of the Deccan, had come with his troops, and was besieging the fort of Kehrla. When this news reached Hūshang Shāh, the humours of his spirit came to motion, and collecting a large army, he advanced to aid and succour the Rāy of Kehrla. Sultān Aḥmad becoming aware of this abandoned the idea of the conquest of Kehrla; and retired towards his own country. Hūshang, at the instigation of the Rāy of Kehrla, pursued him for three stages. Sultān Aḥmad then incited by his high spirit and shame turned round and engaged him. Although in the first assault defeat had fallen on the army of Sultān Aḥmad, yet the latter coming out of ambush attacked the centre of Hūshang's army, and dispersed it. He fled towards Mandū; and the veiled one (his wife) with all the inmates of the harem fell into Sultān Aḥmad's hands. The latter followed the path of generosity, and after making necessary <sup>3</sup> preparations, sent them to Mandū, and sent five hundred horsemen with them to escort them. This incident has been described in detail in the section about the Sultān's of the Deccan.

In the year <sup>4</sup> 835 A.H., 1431 A.D., Sultān Hūshang marched out of Mandū, with the determination to conquer Kālpi. When he arrived

<sup>1</sup> The words are *تا آب دھولپور* in one MS. and *تا آب دھولپور* in the lith. ed. and in the other MS. Firishlah in the corresponding passage has *تا آب دھولپور* as far as the tank or reservoir of Dhōlpūr. I have adopted *تا آب دھولپور* as the correct reading.

<sup>2</sup> Firishlah's account contains greater details. The ruler of Kehrla is called the son of Narsingh Rāy and it is added that Sultān Hūshang came to his succour at his invitation. The way in which the battle was fought, and the way in which Sultān Aḥmad captured the baggage of Hūshang's army, and the latter's wives and daughters, and treated them with great respect and hospitality, and sent them back are described in greater detail. The Cambridge History of India's account, page 351, also agrees, but Kehrla is written as Kherla.

<sup>3</sup> One MS. inserts *حرم* between *ساجان* and *نموده*.

<sup>4</sup> The account of Sultān Hūshang's expedition to Kālpi, as given by Firishlah, agrees generally with that in the text, but he calls the former governor

near that place, news was brought to him that Sultān Ibrāhīm Sharqī was coming with an innumerable host from his capital also to conquer Kālpī. He considered the destruction of Sultān Ibrāhīm should be taken up in preference to the conquest of Kālpī, and advanced to give him battle. When the two armies approached each other, and a battle became a matter of today or tomorrow, Sultān Ibrāhīm's scouts brought the news that Muḥītak Shāh, Sultān of Delhi, availing himself of the opportunity was advancing on Jaumpūr. Sultān Ibrāhīm, giving up the rein of control, started towards Jaumpūr. Hīrahān obtained possession of Kālpī without a contest, and had the public prayer read in his name. He remained there for some days, and placing the chain of gratitude on the shoulders of Qādir Khān, who was a former ruler of Kālpī, returned to Mālwa.

On the way he received petitions from the *thānadārs*, that turbulent tribes from the direction of the Vātā hills had come into his kingdom and had ravaged some villages and towns, and taken shelter in the reservoir of Bhīm. The description of this reservoir is as follows. In ancient times Bhīm had erected an embankment across the valley situated between (two) hills with chiselled stones. Its length and breadth were such that one bank was not visible from the other and its depth was unfathomable. Some days after this, even when they were on the way, 'Uḥmān Khān, Shāhzāda, sent horsemen near the pavilion of 'Ġhaznūn Khān Shāhzāda, who was his elder brother;

and the man seated on his horse abused Ghaznīn Khān, and spoke harsh and unbecoming words about him. Although the ushers and eunuchs forbade him, he would not desist. Then the eunuchs pelted him with stones, and drove him away from the vicinity of the pavilion. 'Uthmān Khān Shāhzāda then came to protect his servants and bastinated the eunuchs. Becoming conscious of the impropriety of his conduct, however, he separated himself from the camp. He tempted the *amīrs* of evil destiny with false promises, and commenced to act traitorously. When all this reached the ears of the Sultān Hūshang, the fire of wrath flamed up in the oven of his heart. He consulted Malik Mughīth Khān Jahān. The latter told him, acts like this have been repeatedly perpetrated by the Shāhzāda, and have been pardoned. On the present occasion also the Sultān might overlook it, so that he might again join the camp. Sultān Hūshang overlooked the act as if by negligence; and Shāhzāda 'Uthmān Khān came back and joined the camp. When Sultān Hūshang spread the shadow of his clemency over the inhabitants of the town of Ujjain, one day he arranged a *majlis* of public audience, and summoned 'Uthmān Khān Shāhzāda with his two brothers, who were Fath Khān and Haibat Khān into his presence, and stood them in the place of punishment; and after reprimanding them made the three of them over to custodians. Then after some days he ordered Malik Mughīth, that he should place them in confinement, take them with him to the fort of Mandū, and guard them there.

<sup>1</sup> He then advanced to chastise and punish the turbulent men of Jātba, and advancing by successive marches, broke down the embankment of the Bhīm reservoir and traversing a distance on wings of speed totally destroyed the refractory people. The Rāja of the country

---

three refractory princes are there said to have been put in chains, and made over to Malik Mughīth. There are indications also of Sultān Hūshang's intentions of making Maḥmūd Khān his heir; but Malik Mughīth always pretended that he had no desire to have the sovereignty for his son.

<sup>1</sup> Firishtah's account of the expedition against these men agrees with that in the text almost word for word; but he calls the Rāja, the Rāja of كوة جابية or the Jābia hill. He also says that among the prisoners there were many daughters and sons (of the Rāja?). The references to these proceedings in Col. Briggs and in the Cambridge History of India are very brief.

at the foot of the Jātba hill fled on foot, and concealed himself in jungle; and his family and all his treasure and wealth fell into the Sultān's hands; and the towns and cities were devastated. So many prisoners were taken, that they were beyond all count. The Sultān returned with victory and triumph and went to the fort of <sup>1</sup> Hūshangābād and passed the rainy season there.

One day he went out with the intention of hunting. While he was out, a *Badaḡhshīnī* ruby fell out of his <sup>2</sup> head-dress. On the 3rd day after that a man who was going on foot brought it back to him. The Sultān gave him a reward of five hundred gold *tankas*; and in connection with this, he told the following anecdote: "One day a ruby fell out of the crown of Sultān Firūz Shāh; and a man who was passing brought it to him. Sultān Firūz Shāh gave him a reward of five hundred gold *tankas*; and said, 'This is a sign of the setting of the sun of my grandeur'; and after some days he departed from this ephemeral world. I also know that the thread of my life has been twisted, and there are not more than a few breaths left." The men who were in the *majlis*, having offered prayers (for his health etc.), submitted that "On the day, on which Sultān Firūz said these words, his age had reached 90 years, while His Majesty the Sultān was yet in the prime of his life and success." Hūshang said that "The number of one's breaths can neither be increased nor diminished." After some days he had an attack of <sup>3</sup> diabetes, while he was still at Hūshangābād. When the Sultān saw the signs of his departure and marks of his demise, he started from Hūshangābād towards Mandū. On the way, he held a *majlis* of public audience, and he gave the seal ring of the kingdom to his true-born son Ghaznīn Khān in the presence of the *amīrs* and his personal attendants and the commanders of the army; and declared him to be his heir. He held the latter's hand

---



and placed him in charge of Maḥmūd Khān. The latter after carrying out the rites of homage, submitted, "As long as there would be remnant of life left in me, I shall not hold myself excused from loyal and devoted service." The Sultān then directed the *amīrs* generally, that they should not soil the field of the kingdom by the dust of malice and hostility.

As the Sultān had, by the clarity of his perception, come to know, that Maḥmūd Khān intended that the office of the sovereign should be transferred to himself, he filled his ears with counsel and advice; and bringing the rights of the support and nurture, which he had received, to his recollection, said, "Sultān Aḥmād Gujrātī is a monarch of great grandeur, and is a lord of the sword. He has always had the determination to conquer Mālwa, and is <sup>1</sup> waiting for an opportune moment. If there is any neglect or dilatoriness in the organisation of the affairs of state, or in the supervision of the troops and subjects, or if there is any negligence in the carrying out of your duties towards Shāhzāda Ghaznīn Khān, his determination to conquer this kingdom will be strengthened; and your union will be changed to dissention."

At the next stage Shāhzāda Ghaznīn Khān sent Malik Maḥmūd Nāmī, who had the title of 'Umdat-ul-mulk to wait on Maḥmūd Khān, and sent him the following message, "If you, the asylum of the *vazārat*, should strengthen the knot of allegiance by oaths, it would be the cause of my mind being greatly assured." Maḥmūd Khān accepted the request of the Shāhzāda, and confirmed his promise and engagements by oaths.

Some *amīrs*, who wanted that Shāhzāda 'Uṭhmān Khān should succeed (to the throne), represented to the Sultān, through Khwājah Naṣr-ul-lah Dabīr, that as Shāhzāda 'Uṭhmān Khān was also a young man of good manners and a true son, it would be right and proper that he should be released from prison, and a part of the country of Mālwa should be allotted to him as his *jāgīr*. Sultān Hūshang said, "This has also appeared to be desirable in my mind, but if <sup>2</sup> I release

<sup>1</sup> The MSS. have منتہی, متہن. The lith. ed., has منتظر. I have retained this. M. Hidayat Ḥosain has adopted منتہی in the text.

<sup>2</sup> The MS. as well as the lith. ed. have only بگذارم which does not make the meaning quite clear. Firishtah makes it clearer by adding the words

'Uthmān Khān, the affairs of the kingdom would be in danger, and disorders and disturbances would take place." When Ghaznīn Khān heard that some *amīrs* had tried to procure the release of 'Uthmān Khān, he again sent Malik Maḥmūd 'Umdat-ul-mulk to wait on Maḥmūd Khān, and represented to him, <sup>1</sup> that they should, in their presence, strengthen the lofty edifice of their agreement by oaths. Maḥmūd Khān joined the Shāhzāda while he was riding on the march, and again swore, that as long as the last remnant of life would be left to him, he would not abandon the side of the Shāhzāda.

When the *amīrs* became acquainted with all these affairs, Malik 'Uthmān Jalūl, who was one of the great *amīrs*, sent two reliable *sardārs* with Malik Mubārak Ghāzī to wait on Maḥmūd Khān. It so happened that Malik Maḥmūd 'Umdat-ul-mulk was yet in attendance on Maḥmūd Khān, when the prayers of Malik Mubārak Ghāzī and those two *amīrs* were brought to him. Maḥmūd Khān left Malik Maḥmūd 'Umdat-ul-mulk in the pavilion, and himself came out and sat at the door, so that Malik Maḥmūd 'Umdat-ul-mulk <sup>2</sup> might hear

که از حبس برآید. Contrary to what is stated in the text and in Firishtah Col. Briggs says that "The King at his (i.e., Mahmood Khan's) instance consented to release the young Prince, Oothman Khan, from confinement, and to give him an estate on which he might reside, and have no plea for disturbing the reign of Ghizny Khan" (vol. IV, pp. 186, 187).

<sup>1</sup> The readings are different, and not quite intelligible. One MS. has که در حضور یکدیگر قصر شامخ عهد را بقسم استحکام دهند. The other has که در حضور یکدیگر قصر شامخ عهد را بقسم محکم سازد; while the lith. ed. has که در حضور یکدیگر قصر شامخ عهد را بقسم استحکام دهند. Firishtah in the corresponding passage has که اگر حضور قصر شامخ عهد را بقسمی استحکام دهند. None of the readings is quite satisfactory. I have adopted the reading of the first MS., which agrees with that in the lith. ed., except that in the latter قصر has been changed my mistake to عصر. Even in this reading, however, the metaphor of culling the agreement a lofty edifice appears to be fantastic. In the reading in Firishtah there is no noun for the adjective شامخ to qualify; and it does not appear quite right that Ghaznīn Khān should call himself *faqīr*, in speaking to Maḥmūd Khān. M. Hidayat Ḥosnīn has که در حضور یکدیگر قصر را بقسم استحکام دهند in the text-edition.

<sup>2</sup> نشود instead of بشود has been adopted in the text-edition.

whatever would be said. When Malik Mubārak Ghāzi came with his two companions, and <sup>1</sup> conveyed the prayers of Malik 'Uthmān Jalāl and Shāhizāda 'Uthmān Khān, Malik 'Uthmān Jalāl represented that, "The questions of the *saḥānat* and the *vazārat* were under consideration; and when a *vazīr* like him was seated on the *masnad*, it was strange that in spite of the fact that 'Uthmān Khān was adorned with liberality and courage and the qualities of administering impartial justice, and of protecting and helping the *ra'iyats*, it should be decided, that Ghaznī Khān should be declared as the heir to the throne. Moreover 'Uthmān Khān has the relationship of a son-in-law to the Malik-ush-sharq (*i.e.*, Malik Muḡhīth, father of Maḥmūd Khān); and therefore his sons are also your (*i.e.*, Maḥmūd Khān's) sons. If infirmity had not prevailed over the Sultān, and <sup>2</sup> if an error had not occurred in his righteousness, he would never have attempted to do such a thing. All the Khāns and *amīrs* urge you, that paying (favourable) attention to the circumstances of 'Uthmān Khān you would not withdraw your hand of support from his head, for if the work of the sovereignty is transferred to 'Uthmān Khān, the kingdom would again acquire greatness and splendour." Maḥmūd Khān replied, "A slave or servant is concerned only with slavery and service. As to authority or over-lording <sup>3</sup> he knows. In the whole

---

<sup>1</sup> There is some difference in the readings. One MS. has دعاء ملک عثمان جلال و شاهزاده عثمان خان رسانید - ملک عثمان جلال معروضداشت. The other MS. inserts رسانید و گفت between عثمان جلال and عثمان خان; while the lith. ed. has رسانید گفت. I have adopted the first reading, but M. Hidayat Hosain has inserted رسانید و گفت between رسانید and عثمان خان. According to lith. ed. of Firishtah also it was Malik 'Uthmān Khān Jalāl who was sent by the partisans of 'Uthmān Khān with Malik Mubārak Ghāzi, but the latter as in the text was the spokesman of the party. Malik 'Uthmān Jalāl is called Mullik Othman Julwany by Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 187).

<sup>2</sup> The MSS. and the lith. ed. of Firishtah all say و در قوی قدری راه نمی یافت, this appears to be incorrect. I have adopted the reading of the lith. ed. of the Ṭabaqāt which has تصویب instead of قوی; but M. Hidayat Hosain has retained قوی in the text-edition.

<sup>3</sup> It is او داند in both the MSS., the lith. ed. and the lith. ed. of Firishtah. I suppose the او or he refers to the Sultān.



of the Sultān's protest and anger, explained to the superintendent of the stables to go near the place, where the Sultān was lying and to repeat these words in a loud voice, so that they might reach the Sultān's ears, and make an impression on his mind, that even while he was still alive, Ghaznīn Khān was stretching his hand to seize his property. When the superintendent of the stables said these words with vigor and emphasis, the Sultān in his unconsciousness, having regained a little perception, said, "Where is my quiver?" and called for the *amīrs*.

The *amīrs*, thinking that God forbid! that the Sultān should have died; and Ghaznīn Khān should have got hold of us by means of this trick, and should destroy us, did not go to the Sultān<sup>1</sup> except Maḥmūd Khān. When this news reached Ghaznīn Khān a great fear and awe fell upon his heart, and he fled and went to Kākrūn, which was three stages from the camp. He sent Malik Maḥmūd 'Umdat-ul-mulk to wait on Maḥmūd Khān with the following message, "All the *amīrs* have combined together to raise 'Uṭhmān Khān to the throne, and I have no one to support me except yourself. As the Sultān had called for his quiver, I thought that he might after arriving at Mandū imprison me also, and place me beside my brothers." Maḥmūd Khān sent the following reply: "You have never done anything contrary to the wishes of the Sultān. I shall explain to the Sultān, the matter of your order about giving the horses, at the right moment." Ghaznīn Khān again sent Malik Maḥmūd 'Umdat-ul-mulk, with the following message: "Although you, the asylum of the *vazārat*, have taken me by the hand, yet as I know that the eunuchs have communicated some displeasing words (about me) to the Sultān, fear has overwhelmed me." Maḥmūd Khān sent this message, "There is no<sup>2</sup> matter. Do you please return soon to the camp, for there is little time, and the sun is about to set." He also wrote a letter in the presence of Malik Maḥmūd 'Umdat-ul-mulk and sent it to Malik Muḥith to the following purport: "His Majesty the Sultān has

---

<sup>1</sup> The words *محبود خان* occur in the MS., and in the lith. ed. The meaning is doubtful.

<sup>2</sup> The word is *قصة*, or *قضية* in the MS., and in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. also has *قصة*.

declared Ghaznīn Khān to be his heir and successor; His Majesty's illness has made him very weak, and those who are near him have given up all hope of his life. It is right that you should make every endeavour to guard Shāhzāda 'Uthmān Khān."

When Malik Maḥmūd went and waited upon Ghaznīn Khān, and gave him Maḥmūd Khān's message, and described the purport of the letter, he was delighted and came back to the camp. When <sup>1</sup> Malik Ānchhā, the paymaster of the forces, and the eunuchs, who were partisans of 'Uthmān Khān, saw that there was a breath left in the Sultān, they determined among themselves, that early next morning, they would place him in a palanquin without informing the *amīrs* and <sup>2</sup> Maḥmūd Khān, and go with all speed to Mandū, and bringing Shāhzāda 'Uthmān Khān out of prison place him on the throne. Maḥmūd Khān having obtained information of the plan became watchful for the death of Hūshang. He ordered the palanquin to be placed on the ground there, and then <sup>3</sup> Ghaznīn Khān, under

<sup>1</sup> The name is ملك انچا in the MS. and ملك انچا in the lith. ed. Firishtah in the corresponding passage has خان جهان.

<sup>2</sup> One MS. omits Maḥmūd Khān. The other MS. has امرا و محمود خان. The lith. ed. has امراء محمود خان. Firishtah lith. ed. has Maḥmūd Khān. I have adopted the second reading, but it may be that the reading of the lith. ed. is correct, for there is no reason why the *amīrs*, who were in favour of 'Uthmān Khān should be kept in ignorance of the plan. If this reading is correct, then the text would be the *amīrs* on the side of Maḥmūd Khān instead of the *amīrs* and Maḥmūd Khān.

<sup>3</sup> There is some difference in the readings here also. The MSS. have غزنين بفرموده غزنين خان while the lith. ed. has بفرموده غزنين خان و محمود خان. Ghaznīn Khān was so much under the thumb of Maḥmūd Khān, that it is quite possible that he should have acted under the orders of the other, and therefore the reading in the MS. which I have accepted is correct; though one would have thought, that whatever the actual relations of the two men might have been, Maḥmūd Khān would have, outwardly at least, acted under the orders of Ghaznīn Khān and not *vice versa*.

Firishtah gives a slightly different account. He says that the Khān Jahān and the eunuchs started with the palanquin with the dying Sultān in it. After they had gone some distance the Sultān died. Maḥmūd Khān obtaining information of this sent men, so that they might reprimand the eunuchs about their haste, and keep the palanquin there. The eunuchs explained that Hūshang had ordered that he should be carried to Mandū as quickly as possible, and they

the orders of Maḥmūd Khān had the royal pavilion fixed up, and occupied himself in putting the corpse into a shroud and coffin. Each one of the *amīrs* (apparently of the opposite faction) went to a secluded place and stayed there.

After the enshrouding of the corpse Maḥmūd Khān came out, and said in a loud voice, "Sultān Hūshang has died under Divine Dispensation; and has made Ghaznīn Khān his heir and successor. Whoever is with us should come and make his homage; and whoever is against us should separate himself from the camp, and should go about his own affairs." Maḥmūd Khān then <sup>1</sup> kissed Ghaznīn Khān's hand, and having rendered him homage, wept much. Then the other *amīrs* one after another kissed Ghaznīn Khān's feet, and wept, crying Alas! Alas! When the accession of Ghaznīn Khān was confirmed by the homage of the *amīrs* and of the great men of the age, they took up the corpse of Sultān Hūshang and carried it towards the <sup>2</sup> *madrassa*; and on the 9th<sup>3</sup> Dhī-hijjah, 838 A.H., consigned it to the dust.

Verses:

Where are the kings of Jamshīd-like power,  
From Hūshang and Jamshīd to Isfandi-yār!  
Farīdūn and Kaīkhusrū and <sup>4</sup> Jām Kū,

were only carrying out his orders. Ghaznīn Khān and Maḥmūd Khān did not give any reply, and the latter ordered the royal pavilion to be set up, and commenced to put the Sultān's corpse into the shroud and coffin.

<sup>1</sup> I think this is the first time in this history, that the ceremony of the kissing of the hands is mentioned. Of course there are plenty of instances of kissing the feet and of kissing the ground near the *Bādshāh's* seat or feet. Here also the other *amīrs* kissed the feet while Maḥmūd Khān alone was privileged to kiss the hand.

<sup>2</sup> Firishtah adds in Shādiābād Mandū.

<sup>3</sup> Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 189) gives the Hijri date as the 9th Zeehuj, 835 and the corresponding A.D. date as 7th September, 1432. The correct date according to the *Tabaqāt* and *Firishtah* is 9th Dhī-hijjah, 838 A.H. The *Cambridge History of India*, page 352, gives July 6th, 1435, as the date of Sultān Hūshang's death. The correct A.D. date according to Sewell and Dikshit's *Indian Calendar* appears to be 7th September, 1435.

<sup>4</sup> I cannot exactly find out what *Jām Kū* means.

Where are gone Shāpūr and Bahrām <sup>1</sup> Gūr.  
 They all rest their heads on brick and dust.  
 Happy he, who, save of good, sowed not seed !

A grand assemblage was convened in the palace of Sultān Hūshang; and Malik Mughīth Khān Jahān and all the other *amīrs* rendered homage, and performed the ceremony of making thanks-offerings.

The period of Hūshang's reign was thirty years. The date of his death (838 A.H.) can be found and understood from the words "Alas ! Shāh Hūshang is no more."

#### AN ACCOUNT OF MUḤAMMAD SHĀH, SON OF HŪSHANG SHĀH GHŪRI.

When Hūshang Shāh accepted the summons of the just God, on the 11th Dhī-hijjah, the *amīrs*, against their wishes, but by the exertion of Malik Mughīth, and the arrangements made by Maḥmūd Khān rendered homage anew to Ghaznīn Khān, who had been chosen by Hūshang. He distinguished each one of the *amīrs* by conferring on them robes of honour and titles, and assured them (of safety). <sup>2</sup> The great and well-known men of Mālwa were made happy by the grant of rewards and stipends. The city of Mandū received the name of Shādīābād, and the public prayers having been read, and the coins struck in the name of Ghaznīn Khān he received the title of <sup>3</sup> Sultān Muḥammad Shāh. Every one who had a fief or a stipend anywhere had it confirmed and resettled. In short, although the *amīrs* had not been pleased with Ghaznīn Khān being made the Sultān, yet owing to the excellence of the management and the skill of Malik Mughīth and Maḥmūd Khān, a new grandeur and splendour appeared in the administration. The people became the new Sultān's adherents, and an affection for him gained an ascendancy over the empire of men's heart. He conferred the title of Masnad-i- 'Ālī Khān Jahān on

<sup>1</sup> One MS. has گور, the other MS. and the lith. ed. of Firishtah have کو. The lith. ed. of the Ṭabaqāt has گو. The name of Bahrām is so closely associated with گور or the wild ass which he hunted, that I have thought that the reading should be گور بهرام. M. Hidayat Hosain has کو بهرام in the text-edition.

<sup>2</sup> One MS. inserts an و before اکابر.

<sup>3</sup> One MS. omits the word شاه.



Malik Mughith, and kept the reins of the *vazārat*, as before, in his powerful grasp.

But as after some days he made attempts on the lives of his brothers, and shed unrighteous blood; and drew the pencil across the eyes of Nizām Khān, his nephew and son-in-law, and of the three sons of the latter, men's heart were filled with abhorrence of him, and hatred took the place of love in them. The blood of his murdered brother was necessarily not a good omen for him; and in a very short time the rule of the empire passed out of his dynasty. <sup>1</sup> Disturbances and rebellion, <sup>2</sup> which had fallen asleep in the country, awoke again; and refractory and turbulent men <sup>3</sup> raised the standard of violence, and the dust of disturbance and rebellion.

Couplet:

If evil thou hast done, hope not danger to escape,  
For, it is right for nature to retaliate.

Among the others the Rājput̃s of the country of <sup>4</sup> Hārūtī placed their feet outside the circle of allegiance and raided a part of the kingdom. When this news reached Sultān Muḥammad Shāh, he nominated Khān Jahān on the 11th of Rabi'-ul-āwwal 839 A.H., to punish them and bestowing two elephants and a special robe of honour on him, started him on the expedition.

He placed the affairs of the soldiery and the *ra'iyats* on the shelf of oblivion, and contracted the habit of continual drinking. He always united and joined up the morning draughts with the evening draughts and *vice versa*. At last one day a number of the old wretches sent him a message through an inmate of his harem, to the effect,

<sup>1</sup> One MS. has اشد پدید آمد after اشوب.

<sup>2</sup> One MS. has خفته instead of خواب شد.

<sup>3</sup> One MS. has برانگیخته instead of برانگیختند.

<sup>4</sup> The name is هاروتی in the MS. and in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has نادوتی, and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 192) has Nandote. The Cambridge History of India does not mention the rebellion here, or the expedition under Malik Mughis to crush it, but later on after Mahmūd Khān had seized the palace, he is said, on page 353, "to have summoned his father, who was engaged in hostilities against the Hāra Rājputs of Harīotī". هاروتی cannot, however, be transliterated as Harīotī. It can be transliterated either as Hārūtī or Hārautī. M. Hidayat Ḥosain has حادوتی Hādūtī in the text.

that a crow of greed had laid an egg of pride in the brain of Maḥmūd Khān; and he was thinking, how he could remove the Sultān out of the way and himself sit on the throne of empire. Sultān Muḥammad made an agreement with those men, that before Maḥmūd Khān could carry this wicked wish from potentiality to actual facts, he himself should be removed out of the way. When this news reached Maḥmūd Khān, he said, <sup>1</sup> "Praise be to God! that the breach of the agreement has not occurred from my side." He occupied himself in attending to his own affairs, and always <sup>2</sup> collected troops and retainers. He went to wait on Sultān Muḥammad with great caution and care. When the Sultān observed the cautious ways of Maḥmūd Khān, it became the cause of increased anxiety and fear. One day, he seized Maḥmūd Khān's hand, and took him into the harem. He called his wife, who was a sister of Maḥmūd Khān, and said in her presence, "It is my hope that you will not do any harm to my life, and the affairs of the kingdom will be in your charge without any contention or hostility". Maḥmūd Khān said, "Perhaps the engagements and oaths have passed out of the Sultān's mind that he brings such words on his tongue. If some malicious persons, for their own wicked purpose, have spoken words to him, he will in the end be abashed and ashamed. If there is any fear or apprehension of me in the mind of the Sultān, I am now alone, and there is nothing to prevent it (my death).

Couplet:

If for loyalty you are, here are my heart and life,  
If for enmity, here are the charger and my head".

Sultān Muḥammad then made his excuses; and the two men behaved with softness and flattery. But as the Sultān was obsessed by his suspicions; words and jestures indicating his <sup>3</sup>distrust appeared

<sup>1</sup> The phrase is written in different ways. It is الحمد لله in one MS. and in the lith. ed.; and is الله الحمد لله in the other. Firishtah lith. ed. has الحمد لله على كل. M. Hidayat Ḥosain has correctly الحمد لله in the text-edition.

<sup>2</sup> One MS. has همه وقت با جمعیت و خود را محافظت می نمود instead of استعداد امی بود, which occurs in the other and in the lith. ed.

<sup>3</sup> One MS. and the lith. ed. have ما اعتمادی, but the other MSS. have what looks like ما اعقابی.

from him every moment. Maḥmūd Khān began to make great exertions and endeavours in gaining his objects. He tempted the Sultān's cup-bearer with much gold, and had the Sultān killed by giving him poison in his wine. The tongue of the circumstances of Sultān Muḥammad thus victimised and done to death, began to sing in this tune; and the faithless time threw up this noise into the curve of the arch of the sky.

Couplets:

A few breaths, I said with pleasure, shall I take,  
 Alas! they were stopped on the path from my heart.  
 Alas! that at the table of the viands of life,  
 I, for a moment partook; and then they said "stop".

When the *amīrs* became cognisant of this, <sup>1</sup> Khwājah Naṣr-ul-lah <sup>2</sup> Parniyānī and Malik Mashīr-ul-mulk, and Laṭīf Zakariyā and some other *sardārs* combined together, and bringing Shāhzāda Mas'ūd Khān, who was in his thirteenth year, out of the harem, placed him on the throne. They agreed among themselves, that they would remove Maḥmūd Khān out of the way by any means that they could. They sent Malik Bāyazīd Shaikhā to him, and told him, "Sultān Muḥammad Shāh has sent for you to come with great quickness; and wishes <sup>3</sup> to send you as an ambassador to Gujrāt." As Maḥmūd Khān was aware of the death of Sultān Muḥammad he replied, "I have relinquished the duties of the *vazārat*, and wish to pass the remaining years of my life, as a sweeper of the tomb of Sultān Hūshang. But notwithstanding this determination of mine, as the marrow of my bones has been nourished by the beneficence of Hūshang Shāh,

<sup>1</sup> The names are as I have them in the text in one MS. except that of Mashīr-ul-mulk, which is that of Shēr-ul-mulk. In the other the name is Malik Mashīr-ul-mulk; and in the lith. ed. Parniyānī is written as Harsūnī; otherwise they agree with the first MS. Firishtah lith. ed. has Khwājah Naṣr Ullah, *vazīr*, and Mashīr ul-mulk and Laṭīf Dhakariyā. The names are not given by Col. Briggs and in the Cambridge History of India. The former (vol. IV, p. 193) has, "The officers about the king's person", and the latter (page 353) "a faction among the nobles".

<sup>2</sup> M. Hidayat Ḥosain has دیر نبانی Dirnibūnī in the text.

<sup>3</sup> The MSS. have رسول, and the lith. ed. has رسولی. It is برسولی in the corresponding passage in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. This would mean, wishes to send you on an embassy, and appears to be a better reading than the others.

if all the *amīrs* would come to my house, then after discussing <sup>1</sup> all differences of counsels, we would report to the Sultān whatever is determined upon, as appears to be right and proper."

Malik Bāyazīd Shāikhbā returned to the *amīrs*, and informed them, that "Maḥmūd Khān has not yet received the news of the Sultān's death; if you will all go together to his house, he will go with you to the palace, and he can then be disposed off." Acting on Bāyazīd Shāikhbā's words the *amīrs* went to Maḥmūd Khān. The latter had kept his men ready in <sup>2</sup> concealed places. When the *amīrs* entered, he asked, "Has the Sultān recovered his senses or is he still lying drunk?" <sup>3</sup> The *amīrs* knew what he was saying. After a moment his men came out of the chambers, and fell upon the *amīrs*. They seized all of them and made them over to guards. As the lofty edifice of the remaining *amīrs*, who were with Mas'ūd Khān tottered under the blow of this news, they collected their troops, and made the retinue of the Sultān ready; and bringing the royal umbrella from the tomb of Sultān Hūshang, raised it over the head of Mas'ūd Khān.

Maḥmūd Khān on hearing this news mounted and advanced towards the palace, with the object of seizing both the Shāhzādas, and disposing off them. When he got near the palace both sides seized their arrows and spears, and the battle of slaughter and bloodshed lasted till night. When the lord of the stars (that is the sun) hid himself behind the veil of darkness, Shāhzāda 'Umar Khān got down from the fort and took the path of flight; and Mas'ūd Khān took sanctuary with Shaikh Jāildah, who was one of the great (holy) men of the age. The *amīrs* fled and betook themselves to the corners of safety. Maḥmūd Khān remained in front of the palace till the morning, fully armed and ready for all emergencies. When the white light of morning appeared from the sea of the darkness of night,

<sup>1</sup> One MS. has شقوق كنكاش, the other has شوق و كنكاش, and the lith. ed. has سقوق كنكاش. Firishtah lith. ed. has شقوق و كنكاش. The first reading is followed in the text-edition.

<sup>2</sup> The word is نهان خانها. The corresponding word in Firishtah lith. ed. is گوشها corners.

<sup>3</sup> The meaning of this is not quite clear, but the same words occur in the MSS. and in the lith. ed., and also in the lith. ed. of Firishtah.

news was brought to him, that the palace was empty, and the enemies, each one of them, had hid themselves in corners.

Mahmūd Khān then entered the palace, and sent a swift messenger to summon his father Khān Jahān. The latter arrived on the wings of speed. Mahmūd Khān assembled the *amīrs* and Maliks and sent the following message to Khān Jahān: <sup>1</sup> "The world cannot exist without a <sup>2</sup> ruler. If the throne of the empire remains unoccupied by the person of a sovereign, many disturbances are produced in the world from the womb of time, the suppression of which becomes difficult. The kingdom of Mālwa has become extensive and refractory, and turbulent men have not yet wakened from sleep. Also the news has not yet reached the Sultāns of the surrounding countries. Otherwise they would have advanced towards us from all directions." Khān Jahān sent the following reply: <sup>3</sup> "No one should attempt to assume <sup>4</sup> this exalted position, which is a twin brother of the rank of the Prophet, unless he is possessed of the qualities of exalted lineage and perfect generosity and bravery and justice and wisdom, (and unless this is the case) the affairs of the empire do not acquire grandeur and glory. Praise be to God! that my son has all those qualities, which a Sultān should possess. It behoves him (therefore) that at an auspicious moment, he should place his foot on the *masnad* of the *sallanat*, and seat himself on the throne of

<sup>1</sup> The message does not contain a direct appeal to Malik Mughīth to assume the sovereignty of Mālwa, though it implies it. Firishtah lith. ed., however, says that Mahmūd Khān wrote to Khān Jahān, that the *sallanat* belongs by right to you; and you should come quickly and seat yourself on the throne. The Cambridge History of India, page 353, also says that Mahmūd Khān "offered the crown to his father", but the latter "declined the honour".

<sup>2</sup> Both MSS. have incorrectly جهانين, people of the world. The lith. ed. has the correct reading جهانباني a ruler. Firishtah in the corresponding passage also has جهانباني.

<sup>3</sup> Khān Jahān's message as given in the MSS., and in the lith. ed. appears to me to be incomplete. It appears to me that some word like کس should be inserted before منقلد, and some words like نباید after نبوت; and the کسی after تا is changed to او. Firishtah lith. ed. omits the words from منقلد to نبوتست; and then the sentence makes good sense.

<sup>4</sup> One MS. and the lith. ed. have ان but the other MS. has اين. This latter appears to me to be better.

empire." When the messenger brought this message, all the *amīrs* and great men applauded this sentiment, and attested to the truth of the word. The astrologers, who knew the stars, were ordered that they should select an auspicious moment for the accession. All the *amīrs* and the wise men of the kingdom and the great men of the city kissed Maḥmūd K̲h̲ān's hand, and congratulated him on his accession.

Couplet:

If one goes, another in his place doth come,  
The world never without a bridegroom (ruler) is.

The period of the rule of Sultān Muḥammad was one year and some months.

#### AN ACCOUNT OF SULTĀN MAḤMŪD K̲H̲ALJĪ.

The narrators of the histories of the Sultān have related, that on Monday <sup>1</sup> the 29th of the month of Shawwāl in the year 839 A.H., Sultān Maḥmūd K̲h̲alji ascended the throne of the *K̲h̲ilāfat* of Mālwa. His age at that time had attained to 34 years. In the whole of the country of Mālwa public prayers were read, and coins struck in his name. All the *amīrs* were gladdened with kindness and favour, and the stipends and rank of each were increased. A number of them were selected, and received titles. Among these Mashīr-ul-mulk had the title of Nizām-ul-mulk conferred on him, and the reins of the *razārat* were placed in his powerful hands. Malik Barkhūrdār received the title of Tāj K̲h̲ān, and the office of the pay-master of the kingdom was entrusted to him. K̲h̲ān Jahān received the title of Ā'zam Humāyūn; and an umbrella and white quiver, which were specially reserved for sultāns, were bestowed on him; and it was also settled that the harems and equeries of Ā'zam Humāyūn should have staffs of gold and silver in their hands, and, whenever he should mount or dismount, should say in a loud voice: In the name of the benevolent and merciful God!, which in those days was the exclusive privilege of sultāns.

---

<sup>1</sup> Col. Briggs (vol. IV, page 196) gives the corresponding A.D. date as May 16th, 1435. The Cambridge History of India, page 353, gives 13th May, 1436, as the date of Maḥmūd K̲h̲alji's accession. According to Sewell and Dikshit's Indian Calendar the day and date appear to be Thursday, the 24th of August, 1435.

When the empire was firmly fixed on Sultān Maḥmūd, he devoted his energy to the support of learned and wise men; and whenever he heard of any person of great ability, he sent money to him, and summoned him. He also established colleges in his kingdom, and granted stipends to the learned men and to students, and kept them occupied with imparting and receiving knowledge and learning. In short, the country of Mālwa in the period of his rule became an object of envy to Shīrāz and Samarcand.

As the work of the government was properly administered and all the affairs of the kingdom acquired order, <sup>1</sup> Malik Quṭb-ud-dīn Shaibānī and <sup>2</sup> Malik Naṣīr-ud-dīn Dabīr, and a number of the other Hūshang Shāhī *amīrs*, owing to their envy, attempted to act treacherously in concert with <sup>3</sup> Malik Yūsuf Qawām. With the object of carrying out their intention, they placed a ladder one night, and climbed to the roof of a *masjid* which was adjacent to the palace of Maḥmūd Shāh. From that place they came down to the courtyard of the palace, and were thinking what they should do next. At this time Maḥmūd Shāh appeared there, and with very great bravery came out of the house with his quiver bound round him; and coming within bow-shot wounded some (of them). About this time <sup>4</sup> Niẓām-ul-mulk and Malik <sup>5</sup> Maḥmūd Khidr arrived fully armed

from outside with a body of *silāhdārs*. The conspirators fled by the very route by which they had entered, and made their escape. One of them, however, who had been wounded by an arrow, could not descend by the ladder; and threw himself on the ground from the roof of the mosque. His leg was broken, and he was seized, and was taken (before the Sultān ?); and he wrote down the names of all the men who were among the conspirators. Early next morning, they were all brought before the Sultān, and were punished.

But Ā'zam Humāyūn begged for the <sup>1</sup> pardon of the offences of Shāhzāda Aḥmad Khān, son of Hūshang Shāh, and Malik Yūsuf Qawām and <sup>2</sup> Malik Anchhā and Malik Naṣīr-ud-dīn Dabīr, although they had had a full share in creating the disturbance; and selected the fort of Islāmābād for the Shāhzāda; and conferred the title of Qawām Khān and the fief of Bhilsā on Malik Yūsuf Qawām; the fief of Hūshangābād on Malik Anchhā; and the title of Naṣrat Khān, and the fief of Chandēri by deputation (*Niyābat*) to Malik Naṣīr-ud-dīn. They obtained leave to go to their *jāgīrs*. When Shāhzāda Aḥmad Khān reached Islāmābād, he at once raised the dust of disturbance and rebellion. His forces began to increase day by day, and although Tāj Khān, who had been nominated to suppress them, sat down at the foot of the fort of Islāmābād, he was unable to effect any result. Aḥmad Khān sent out a detachment every day from the fort, and kept (the men at) the foot of the fort hotly engaged in battle. Tāj Khān sent a petition, and begged for reinforcements. About this time scouts brought the news to the Sultān that Malik Anchhā, the feudatory of Hūshangābād, and Naṣrat Khān the feudatory of Chandēri had raised the flag of hostility and the standard of revolt. Sultān Maḥmūd sent Ā'zam Humāyūn Khān Jahān, to teach the rebels a lesson, and to arrange all the affairs of the country. When the latter arrived within two *karōhs* of Islāmābād, Tāj Khān and the other *sardārs* hastened to meet him, and explained the true state of

<sup>1</sup> The word is استغفار in one MS. and استعفى in the other. The lith. ed. has what looks like استعفاز. Firishtah lith. ed. has استعفى. M. Hidayat Ḥosain has adopted استعفاء in the text-edition.

<sup>2</sup> He is not mentioned by Firishtah here, but later on in the distribution of fiefs he is called ملك جهاد in the lith. ed., and Mullik Itihad by Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 198).



things to him. On the second day, he started, and having occupied the environs of the fort, distributed the batteries. The next day he sent a number of wise men and Shaikhs to Aḥmad Khān, so that they might after filling his ears with the pearls of advice and the gems of precepts, warn him of the evil effects of a breach of agreements and engagements. Although the Shaikhs and learned men read the texts of persuasion and intimidation to him, his stony heart did not become affected. In reply to the sound precepts he gave equally rare replies, and having given permission to the kind-hearted preceptors sent them out of the fort. Qawām Khān also, acting in a spirit of hostility, sent some arms and other war-like materials to him from his own battery, and strengthened the <sup>1</sup> foundations of amity by promises and engagements. When the <sup>2</sup> siege was prolonged, <sup>3</sup> one day one of the musicians gave poison to Aḥmad Khān in his wine; and throwing himself out of the citadel joined the camp of Ā'zam Humāyūn; and the fort was captured. Ā'zam Humāyūn after arranging matters there left one of his trusted men at that place, and marched towards Hūshangābād.

On the way Qawām Khān fled from Ā'zam Humāyūn's camp, and went away towards Bhilsā. Ā'zam Humāyūn considered the overthrow of Malik Anchhā to be of primary importance, and continued his advance to Hūshangābād. Malik Anchhā, finding that he had not the strength to meet him, left all his equipage and other things, and went away towards the foothills of Gōndwāna. When the Gōnds knew that he had turned his face from his lord and master, they collected in large numbers and blocked his way; and killed all of them by pelting them with stones, and shooting them with arrows, and plundered all their goods and property. Ā'zam Humāyūn on

<sup>1</sup> One MS. and the lith. ed. have بنیان, but the other MS. has بنیاد.

<sup>2</sup> One MS. has کار محاصره, the other omits کار, while the lith. ed. has طول محاصره. Firihtah in the corresponding passage has کار محاصره.

<sup>3</sup> Firihtah makes this somewhat clearer by saying باختگی اعظم همايون يا بذایر مقدمه دبرو, i.e., either at the instigation of Ā'zam Humāyūn or for some other reason; and adds زهر داده بکشت. The Cambridge History of India, page 353, says positively that Ahmad Khān was poisoned "at the instigation of Muslims."

hearing this news was highly pleased and entered the fort of Hūshangābād. He arranged the affairs of that quarter in the best manner, and left one of his trusted men there; and advanced towards Chandēri, to chastise Naṣrat Khān.

When he arrived within two stages of Chandēri, Naṣrat Khān, finding himself weak and helpless, came out to meet him; and wanted <sup>1</sup> to cover up his misdeeds with grass. Ā'zam Humāyūn sent for the Saiyids and the learned and great men of the city, and collected them together, and asked each one of them to describe the behaviour and circumstances of Naṣrat Khān. Each one of them told a story, most of which were: that the crow of pride and vanity had laid an egg in his brain, so that marks of hostility and rebellion have made their appearance. Ā'zam Humāyūn transferred the government of Chandēri from Naṣrat Khān to <sup>2</sup> Malik-ul-umarā Ḥājī Kamāl; and advanced towards Bhilsā. Although he sent men of rank to Qawām Khān, and tried to guide him in the right path, it was productive of no good result. Qawām Khān got out of Bhilsā and fled. Ā'zam Humāyūn halted there for a few days, and after assuring his mind of the affairs of that country, turned his face towards the capital city of Shādiābād.

On the way news was brought to him, that Sultān Aḥmad Gujrāti was advancing with the object of conquering Mālwa; and had sent Shāhzāda Mas'ūd Khān with a large army and twenty elephants <sup>3</sup> to attack him. Ā'zam Humāyūn started with rapidity, and passing the army of Sultān Aḥmad at a distance of six *karōhs* entered the fort of Mandū by the Tārāpūr gate. Maḥmūd Shāh was delighted at the arrival of his father, and performed the rites of offering thanks to God. He sent out detachments every day from the fort, and went on fighting hard. With great bravery and courage he wanted to sally out of the fort and engage in a drawn battle. But as the thorn of the hostility of the Hūshang Shāhi *amīrs* had caught in his skirts.

<sup>1</sup> The words are *خس پوش سازد* in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. and also in the lith. ed. of *Firishtah*.

<sup>2</sup> The name is as in the text in the MSS. and in the lith. ed.; but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 213) Mullik Kaloo.

<sup>3</sup> Both MSS. and the lith. ed. have *بر سر شما*. *Firishtah* lith. ed. in the corresponding passage has *بر سرش*.

In accordance with this intention (Sultān Maḥmūd) turned his face of determination in the direction of Sārangpūr; and sent Tāj Khān and Maṣṣūr Khān in advance of himself. As Sultān Aḥmad had left Malik Hāji 'Alī at the fort of Kanbal to guard the road and keep it open, Tāj Khān and Maṣṣūr Khān, who had arrived there before Sultān Maḥmūd, fought with him. The latter fled and took the news to Sultān Aḥmad, that Sultān Maḥmūd had come out of the fort, and was marching towards Sārangpūr. Sultān Aḥmad sent a messenger to Sārangpūr (with the direction), that the Shāhzāda should, before the arrival of Sultān Maḥmūd, betake himself to Ujjain. After the arrival of the messenger Shāhzāda Muḥammad Khān started from Sārangpūr, with great caution and vigilance, and came and waited upon Sultān Aḥmad at Ujjain.

<sup>1</sup> Malik Ishāq, the son of Qutb-ul-mulk, the feudatory of Sārangpūr sent a petition to the Sultān; and asking for pardon for his guilt, wrote that Muḥammad Khān had left Sārangpūr, and had gone away to Ujjain on hearing the news of the advance; but Shāhzāda 'Umr Khān had sent an army in advance of himself with the object of seizing Sārangpūr, and was himself following behind it. On becoming acquainted with the purport of the petition Sultān Maḥmūd was highly pleased; and drew the pen of pardon across the page of Malik Ishāq's offences; and sent Tāj Khān in advance of himself to Sārangpūr and he himself also advanced in that direction. When Tāj Khān arrived at Sārangpūr, he comforted and re-assured Malik Ishāq and all the inhabitants and leaders of the bands of Sārangpūr of the Sultān's rewards and favours. On the Sultān's arrival after they had rendered homage, the Sultān conferred the title of Daulat Khān on Malik Ishāq and bestowed on him a standard and a <sup>2</sup> *ṭās* and a gold embroidered *gabā* (robe), and ten thousand gold *tankas* in cash and doubled his stipend. He also bestowed on the heads of the different groups and the residents of the city some horses, and fifty thousand

<sup>1</sup> The name is ملك اسحاق in one MS. and in the lith. ed. It is ملك اسحاق in the other MS. and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. I have adopted ملك اسحاق.

<sup>2</sup> The dictionary gives cup, goblet, dish and brocade as meanings of طاس *ṭās*. None of these meanings appears to be appropriate.

*tankas* to distribute among themselves. When he reached Sārangpūr, the scouts brought the news that Shāhzāda ‘Umr Khān had burnt down the town Bhilsā, and had arrived at the boundary of Sārangpūr; and that Sultān Aḥmad Gujrātī had also come out of Ujjain with thirty thousand horsemen and three hundred elephants, and was advancing towards Sārangpūr. Sultān Maḥmūd considered that it would be advisable to undertake the destruction of ‘Umr Khān in the first instance, and commenced an advance at the end of the night.

When there was a distance of six *karōhs* between the two armies, (he) sent a detachment as an advance guard, and they seized some prisoners from whom a knowledge of the condition of the enemy’s army could be obtained, and brought them to the Sultān who made an enquiry from them of the state of ‘Umr Khān’s army. He sent Nizām-ul-mulk and <sup>1</sup> Malik Aḥmad Ṣilāḥ, and a number of others, so that they might reconnoitre the jungle and the roads. He arranged the army in four detachments, and advanced early in the morning to attack ‘Umr Khān. The latter also becoming aware of Sultān Maḥmūd’s advance hastened to meet him: and having arranged his troops sent them to confront him. But he himself took up a position <sup>2</sup> on the top of a hill and there remained in ambush waiting for an opportunity. It so happened, however, that some one brought the information to Sultān Maḥmūd that ‘Umr Khān was hiding in ambush with some troops on the top of a hill. Sultān Maḥmūd with a well-equipped force advanced towards him. ‘Umr Khān said to the <sup>3</sup> soldiers who were with him: “It would be a reflection on their good name to fly from the son of a servant: and it is better to be slain than to baulk behind.” He then fell upon Sultān Maḥmūd’s army with the men who were united with him: but was taken prisoner, and was put to death by the Sultān’s order. His head was placed on the top of a lance and was shown to the army of Chandēri. The leaders and commanders of that army were amazed and thunder-

<sup>1</sup> The name is Malik Aḥmad Ṣilāḥdār in Firishtah. See note 3 on page 502. where also the name is Malik Aḥmad Ṣilāḥ in the MS. and in the lith. ed. of the *Tabaqāt*, but Aḥmad Ṣilāḥdār in Firishtah.

<sup>2</sup> Firishtah lith. ed. has *بر سر کوه* instead of *پس کوه*; this is better: but as the MSS. and the lith. ed. have I have retained it.

<sup>3</sup> One MS. has *بسپایانی* but the other and the lith. ed. have *بسپایان*.

struck; and sent the following message, "Please cease the <sup>1</sup> battle for this day; so that early next morning, we may wait on you and render homage to you anew." On this agreement, both the armies encamped for the night. (But) when night came on, the Chandēri army retired towards its own country; and when it arrived at Chandēri, the *amīrs* joined together, and placed Malik Sulaimān, son of <sup>2</sup> Malik Shēr-ul-mulk Ghūrī, who had been the *nāib* of 'Umr Khān, giving him the title of Sultān Shihāb-ud-dīn.

Sultān Maḥmūd detached an army for crushing him, and advanced himself to fight with Sultān Aḥmad. But the two armies had not yet met each other, when some of <sup>3</sup> the pious men in the army of Sultān Aḥmad saw His Holiness the last of the Prophet, on whom be the benediction and salutation!, in a dream, as declaring that, "A calamity has descended from the sky, tell Sultān Aḥmad, that he should carry the goods of his safety out of this country." When they informed Sultān Aḥmad of this dream, he did not put much faith in it. (But) within the next two or three days a pestilence appeared in his army, so that the soldiers had no time even for digging the graves. Sultān Aḥmad now having no alternative, went back to Gujrāt by way of Āshta; but he gave a promise to Shāhzāda Mas'ūd Khān that he would seize the country in the course of the next year, and would deliver it over to him.

Sultān Maḥmūd then went to the fort of Māndū, and having, within the course of seventeen days, re-equipped his army advanced to quench the flame (of rebellion) in Chandēri. When he arrived there Malik Sulaimān came out of the citadel with the *amīrs*, and made brave efforts; but as they had not the requisite strength, they fled,

<sup>1</sup> The words جنگی را occur in one MS., but not in the other or in the lith. ed. I have inserted them as they make the meaning complete. The words موقوف دارند are in one MS., and in the lith. ed., but in the other MS. they are موقوف دارند. I consider this is better and have adopted it. M. Hidayat Ḥosain has retained موقوف دارند in the text-edition.

<sup>2</sup> Firishtah calls him Malik Mashīr-ul-mulk who was the *nāib* and a near relative of Sultānzāda 'Umr Khān. M. Hidayat Ḥosain has ملک شیر ملک in the text-edition.

<sup>3</sup> Firishtah lith. ed. has مالکان, instead of صاحبان.

and again taking shelter in the citadel fortified themselves in it. But Malik Sulaimān died there quite suddenly.

The *amīrs* selected another to be their leader and, making the necessary preparations for carrying on the warfare, came out of the citadel. They fought, but again had to flee and take shelter in the fort. When the period of the siege had extended to <sup>1</sup> eight months, Sultān Maḥmūd <sup>2</sup> took advantage of an opportunity; and <sup>3</sup> one night climbed over the wall of the fort; and after him other brave men did so; and the citadel was seized; and a large number became food for the sword. But one party fled and <sup>4</sup> fortified themselves in a fort, which was situated on the top of a hill. After some days Ismā'il Khān (of) Kālpī obtained quarter, and brought them down from the fort. Sultān Maḥmūd having arranged the affairs of that territory in the best way, and having allotted Chandērī as a *jāgīr* to Malik Muẓaffar Ibrāhīm, intended to return. But his scouts brought the news that Dūngar Sēn had come from the fort of <sup>5</sup> Gwāliar; and had besieged the <sup>6</sup> city of Narwar. In spite of the fact, that his army

<sup>1</sup> The period is eight months in both MSS., and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. and in Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 204). It is seven months in the lith. ed. of the Ṭabaqāt. and in the Cambridge History of India.

<sup>2</sup> The word is انتظار in one MS. and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. It is انتہای in the other MS. and in the lith. ed. of the Ṭabaqāt. The dictionary meaning of انتہای is act of rising, getting up; another word انتہاز means watching for, finding an opportunity. I think انتہاز is more appropriate than انتظار or انتہای and this is adopted by M. Hidayat Ḥosain in the text-edition.

<sup>3</sup> One MS. has پیش instead of شبی. This appears to be a mistake.

<sup>4</sup> There are some variations in the readings. One MS. and the lith. ed. have متحصن شدند; the other has متحصن شده; and further on one MS. and the lith. ed. have اسمعیل خان کالپی انجماعت را امان گرفته, while the other has اسمعیل خان کالپی نانجماعت امان گرفته. I have accepted شدند. As to the other difference there is apparently not much to choose. I have adopted the readings of the first MS. and the lith. ed. In the text-edition M. Hidayat Ḥosain has اُن جماعه instead of ان جماعت. Firishtah gives the conditions on which quarter was granted.

<sup>5</sup> Gwāliar is spelt گوالیر in both MSS., and in the lith. ed.; but on previous occasions it was spelt as گوالیار, and is so spelt here also in Firishtah.

<sup>6</sup> The name is شهر نور the new city, in one MS., and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. It is شهر نورور the city of Narwar in the other MS., and شهر نور the city of Nūr or

was, owing to its being the rainy season and the long period of the siege, <sup>1</sup> in much distress, Maḥmūd Shāh advanced towards Gwāliar by successive rapid marches. When leaving his own territory, he arrived near Gwāliar, he commenced to plunder and ravage the country. A body of Rājput̃s came out of the fort, and engaged in a battle; but as they had not the strength to withstand the assaults of Maḥmūd Shāh's army they fled, and entered into the <sup>2</sup> aperture of the fort. Dūngar Sēn on hearing this news decided on a retreat and raised the siege, and fled to Gwāliar. As Maḥmūd's object was to release Narwar from the siege, he did not occupy himself with besieging Gwāliar and returned to Shādīābād.

In the year 843 A.H., (1439 A.D.), he commenced the erection of the tomb of Sultān Hūshang, and the completion of the *Jāma' Masjid* of Hūshang Shāh, which is situated near the <sup>3</sup> Rām Sarāi gate, and

Naur in the lith. ed. of the Ṭabaqāt, though later on, it is شهر نور in it also. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 205) has Nurwur. The Cambridge History of India, page 354, has "a town named Shahr-i-Nau, not now traceable". The evidence in support of the reading Shahr-i-Nau appears to be good, but I think شهر نور or the city of Narwar is the correct reading. Narwar is situated on the river Sind opposite to Jhānsī, and would be on the way from Gwāliar. The Cambridge History of India (p. 354) calls Dūngar Sēn "Dongar Singh the Ṭonwār of Gwalior." The name is Dūngar Sēn in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. of the Ṭabaqāt and also in the lith. ed. of Firishtah, but Col. Briggs has Dongar Sing. After Timūr's invasion, Gwalior according to the Cambridge History of India, page 241, was held by the Tonwar Rājputs, but the name of Tonwar does not appear in the list of the Rajpoot royal races given on page 63 of Tod's *Rajasthan*, vol. I, the nearest approach to that name being the Tuars, which appears in the lists by the Kheechie Bard, and by the author (Col. Tod). It is true that the Imperial Gazetteer of India, vol. XII, page 441, agrees with the Cambridge History of India in saying that "After Timur's invasion Gwalior was seized by the Tonwar Rajputs." But Tonwar is spelt there as it indeed is on page 241 of the Cambridge History with the short a and not with the long a as on page 354. M. Hidayat Ḥosain has شهر نور in the text-edition.

<sup>1</sup> The MSS. have بر نشان, and the lith. ed. has کھ بر نشان. Firishtah lith. ed. has پریشان. This appears to be the correct reading and I have accepted it.

<sup>2</sup> The MSS. and the lith. ed. and the lith. ed. of Firishtah all have بسوارخ قلعه در آمدند.

<sup>3</sup> The name of the gate is variously given. One MS. has دروازه رام سراي, Rām Sarāi gate. Another has what looks like دروازه هاراسوي the Hārāsūi gate.

had two hundred and thirty cupolas, and three hundred and eighty<sup>1</sup> pillars (minarets?); and these were completed in a short time.

In the year <sup>2</sup> 845 A.H., petitions from the *amīrs* of Mēwāt, and the great and holy men of the metropolitan city of Dehli came in, rapid succession, to the effect, that Sultān Muḥammad (son of Mubārak Shāh) was unable properly to discharge the high and onerous duties of sovereignty; and consequently the hands of the oppressors and of turbulent men had come out of the sleeve of tyranny and oppression; and there was nothing left of peace and quietness, except in name and a story. As the tailor of faith and providence had sewn the robe of sovereignty on the elegant stature of that asylum of sovereignty, the generality of the residents of this country wish, that they should place the collar of allegiance to him on their neck of submission and subjection with willingness and alacrity. In the latter part of the year, Sultān Maḥmūd advanced towards Dehli with a well-equipped army. In the neighbourhood of the town of Hindaun, Yūsuf Khān Hindaunī waited on him. When he encamped in the village of <sup>3</sup> Panna, Sultān Aḥmad took up a position with Tughlaqābād at his rear. The

while the lith. ed. has دروازه رامنواي. Firishtah lith. ed. has دروازه راموي, and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 205) has the Rampoorā gate.

<sup>1</sup> The MSS., and the lith. ed. have استوانه, which according to the dictionary means a cylinder. The lith. ed. has ستون a pillar. The mosque according to Firishtah lith. ed. has two hundred and eight *istūānas*; and according to Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 205), "two hundred and thirty minarets and two hundred and sixty arches."

<sup>2</sup> The MSS. as well as the lith. ed. have 845 A.H., but Firishtah lith. ed. has 844 A.H., and Col. Briggs has 844 A.H., 1440 A.D. The Cambridge History of India, page 354, also has 1440 A.D. For an account of these transactions, as given in the history of Sultān Muḥammad Shāh of Dehli, see page 271 of vol. I, Persian text, and pages 327, 328 of vol. I, English translation of this work. The Dehli Sultān is here called Sultān Maḥmūd Mubārak Shāh in one MS., and in the lith. ed., and Sultān Muḥammad Mubārak Shāh in the other MSS., and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah, though in the Dehli section he was called Sultān Muḥammad Shāh. He was the adopted son of Mubārak Shāh and the correct reading here should be Muḥammad Shāh, son of Mubārak Shāh, The Cambridge History of India, page 354, calls him "Sayyid, Muhammad Shāh."

<sup>3</sup> One MS. has پنه Panna, while the other has what looks like تبة Tabta, while the lith. ed. has پنه Patna.



next day Sultān Maḥmūd divided his army into three detachments. He placed two of them under the commands of Sultān Ghiyāth-ud-dīn, and of <sup>1</sup> Ghaznīn Khān who had the title of Sultān 'Alā-ud-dīn; and sent them against Sultān Muḥammad's army; and kept the third force of selected soldiers with himself. <sup>2</sup> Sultān Muḥammad sent out Malik Bahlūl Lūdī and Saiyid Khān and Daryā Khān and Quṭb Khān and other commanders, and engaged them in battle. Up to nightfall, brave men experienced in warfare stopped out from both sides and gave proofs of their courage and bravery. In the end both parties sounded the drum of retreat and took up their positions in their original stations.

<sup>3</sup> It so happened that on that very night Sultān Maḥmūd saw in a dream, that some audacious low men had risen in revolt in the fort of Mandū, and had brought the royal umbrella from the tomb of Sultān Hūshang, and raised it over the head of a man of obscure descent. In the morning there were signs of anxiety and <sup>4</sup> distress in him. At this time Sultān Muḥammad sent emissaries, and struck at the door of peace. Sultān Maḥmūd immediately agreed to a pacific settlement, and started on the journey back to Mālwa. On the way, news came to him, that as it had happened, on that very night a mob of the common people had raised the dust of disorder and disturbance in Mandū, but it had been quelled by the exertions and

<sup>1</sup> He is called Qadm Khān in one MS. and Ghaznīn Khān in the other and Naṣrat Khān in the lith. ed. Qadm Khān seems to be the correct reading, see note 4, page 327, vol. I, English translation of this work, and I have adopted it.

<sup>2</sup> One MS. has by mistake Sultān Maḥmūd.

<sup>3</sup> Firishtah agrees mainly as to the three versions of the reason of Sultān Maḥmūd's return to Mālwa, though the lith. ed. says that he saw the revolt in the fort of Mandū in an واقعه, happening and not in a dream. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 206) says that he saw it in a dream. But the Cambridge History of India, page 354, says that Maḥmūd readily accepted Muhammad Shāh's proposed terms of peace, as he "had learnt that during his absence the mob had risen in Māndū, removed the gilded umbrella from the tomb of Hūshang, and raised it over the head of a pretender." It has thus converted what Sultān Maḥmūd saw in a dream into a series of actual events.

<sup>4</sup> The MSS. have و بیمرگی and و بمرگی after تردد while the lith. ed. has no similar words. Firishtah in the corresponding passage has و بیمرگی, and I have adopted it. M. Hidayat Ḥosain has و بمردگی in the text-edition.

management of Ā'zam Humāyūn. It has, however, come under my notice that it appears in some history that news was conveyed to Sultān Maḥmūd, that Sultān Aḥmad Gujrātī was about to invade Mālwa; and for this reason Sultān Maḥmūd came back. This version appears to be the most correct.

In short, Sultān Maḥmūd arrived in Shādīābād on the <sup>1</sup> 1st of Muḥarram 846 A.H.; and made the deserving men there partake of his gifts and benefactions. In the same year he laid out a garden in the land appertaining to the town of Na'icha; and built a dome and a few great palaces in it; and remained for some time in Shādīābād.

<sup>2</sup> After a short time he repaired the casualties and the damages sustained by his army; and marched out towards Chitōr with the determination of chastising the Rājput̄s. <sup>3</sup> At this time, <sup>4</sup> news was brought to the Sultān of the arrogance of Naṣīr, <sup>5</sup> son of 'Abd-ul-qādir, the governor of Kālpī, who had assumed the title of Naṣīr Shāh, and had declared his independence; and letters had come from both the great men and the ordinary inhabitants of the country, that he had placed his foot outside the straight and strong path of the law of the Prophet, and was struggling on the path of heresy and oppression; and (they) were crying for justice from his oppression and tyranny. Sultān Maḥmūd placed the destruction of Naṣīr Shāh in the forefront of his energies; and <sup>6</sup> advanced towards Kālpī.

<sup>1</sup> The name of the month is left out in the MSS., and in the lith. ed. of *Firishtah*, but is given as Muḥarram in the lith. ed. of the *Ṭabaqāt*. Of course the first day of Muḥarram is also the first day of the year. The year is 846 A.H., in the MSS. and in the lith. ed.; but is 845 A.H., in the lith. ed. of *Firishtah* and 845 A.H., 1441 A.D., in Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 207).

<sup>2</sup> One MS. has *و بعد ازانکه شکست و ریخت لشکر خود را درست کرد*, instead of what I have in the text, which is the reading of the other MSS. and the lith. ed.

<sup>3</sup> The sentence is long and rather clumsily worded.

<sup>4</sup> The word *خبر* is omitted in one MS., and in the lith. ed.

<sup>5</sup> The word *ولد* after *نصیر* is omitted in the MSS. and the text-edition. It is in the lith. ed. of *Firishtah*, and as it is required to make sense I have inserted it.

<sup>6</sup> One MS. has instead of *عازم کالپی گشت*, which occurs in the other and in the lith. ed. and in the lith. ed. of *Firishtah*, by mistake *متوجه سواد اعظم همایون کالپی گشت*.

Naṣīr <sup>1</sup> (son of) ‘Abd-ul-qādir, having received information of the advance of Sultān Maḥmūd, sent <sup>2</sup> ‘Alī Khān, his uncle, with many beautiful things and presents and various kinds of tributes, and submitted a representation to the effect, that “Whatever they have said in respect of me, is entirely false and a fabrication; and in order to decide this matter, if you will send truthful men and will find out the truth, you can mete out any punishment that I may deserve if even a small part of it be proved to be true.” Sultān Maḥmūd <sup>3</sup> did not grant an audience to the emissary for some days; and advanced stage after stage. When he arrived in the neighbourhood of Sārangpūr, he, at the suggestion of Ā‘zam Humāyūn and other chief men of the state, drew the pen of forgiveness across the <sup>4</sup> page of Naṣīr’s offences, granted permission to his emissary to make his *kūrnish*, accepted his tribute, and sending him letters containing counsel and precepts gave permission to ‘Alī Khān to go back; and turned towards the country of Chitōr.

When he crossed the <sup>5</sup> river of Bhīm, he sent detachments every day in different directions in the country of Chitōr and devastated it and plundered and took the people prisoners, and pulling down idol temples, laid the foundations of mosques. He halted for three or four days at each stage. When he encamped at Kōnbhalmīr, which is one of the greatest forts of that country, and is famous for its strength in the whole country of <sup>6</sup> Hindūstān, there the *raḥīl* of Rāy Kōnbhā, who was named Dēbā, fortified himself, and sent out troops

<sup>1</sup> Here also the man is named نصير عبد القادر and the word ولد or بن is omitted in the MSS., the lith. ed., and the text-edition.

<sup>2</sup> One MS. has علي خاں instead of علي خان. Firishṭah calls him Naṣīr Khān’s معلم or tutor and not his uncle.

<sup>3</sup> One MS. has نديد instead of بار نداد.

<sup>4</sup> The word منقذ is only in one MS. before تقصيرات, but I have inserted it, as it is required to make the metaphor complete.

<sup>5</sup> Both the MSS. and the lith. ed. and the lith. ed. of Firishṭah call it the آب بهیم. There was a حوض بهیم mentioned before, see page 481: but it cannot be identical with آب بهیم. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 208) calls it the Bunas river.

<sup>6</sup> Both MSS. have از انجا, but the lith. ed. and the lith. ed. of Firishṭah have در انجا. This is better, and I have adopted it. It would appear that according to the Ṭabaqāt and Firishṭah it was the fort of Kōnbhalmīr itself that Dēbā Rāy fortified himself in; but according to Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 208)

to carry on skirmishes. It so happened, that they had built a grand temple opposite to the fort, and had drawn a line of fortifications round it, and had stored provisions and war materials<sup>1</sup> in it. Sultān Maḥmūd directed his energies to the capture of the fortifications round the temple, and seized them in the course of a week. A large number of Rājapūts became food for the sword, and others were plundered and taken prisoners. Sultān Maḥmūd ordered that the buildings appertaining to the temple should be filled with firewood and set on fire, and he poured <sup>1</sup> water and vinegar over the walls; and in the winking of an eye, those grand edifices, which had taken so many years to erect, were rent asunder and crumbled down. The idols were also broken up, and given to the butchers (Col. Briggs adds "of the camp"), so that they might use them as weights for their scales for the sale of meat. The largest idol which had been fashioned in the shape of a <sup>2</sup> sheep, was converted into lime, and given with the

---

it was, "one of the forts in the Koombulmore district." And he calls its defendant Beny Ray. The Cambridge History of India, page 355, is delightfully vague here, and says "he captured a fort and destroyed a temple, and advanced to Chitor." It is curious that there is no mention of these incidents in Tod's *Rajasthan*. On the other hand Tod (vol. I, p. 222) says that in S. 1496 A.D. (1440 A.D.), the kings of Malwa and Guzerat "at the head of powerful armies, invaded Mewar. Koombho met them on the plains of Malwa bordering on his own state, and at the head of one hundred thousand horse and foot and fourteen hundred elephants, gave them an entire defeat, carrying captive to Chetore Mahmood the Khilji sovereign of Malwa." We have no mention of this victory in either the Ṭabaqāt or in Firishtah, but according to Col. Tod, Abul Fuzil mentions it, and dilates on Koombho's greatness of soul in setting his enemy at liberty, not only without ransom but with gifts. Col. Tod, also says that Mahmood was confined for six months in Chetore, that Rana Sanga's son gave Baber the crown of the Malwa king, one of the trophies of the conquest, and finally that there is a more durable record of the victory in the inscription on the triumphal pillar of Chetore, of which Koombho laid the foundation eleven years after the event, and which was completed in ten years.

<sup>1</sup> One MS. and the lith. ed. have آب و سرکه, while the other MS. has آب سرکه; but Firishtah lith. ed. has آب سرد. He, however, agrees with the Ṭabaqāt in saying that water was poured over the wall, but Col. Briggs says that cold water was thrown on the stone images.

<sup>2</sup> Col. Briggs (vol. IV, page 209, footnote) says probably the figure was one of a bull, for, as he says, there is no other instance of the image of a sheep or a ram being treated as an object of worship by the Hindūs.

*pān* leaf to the Rājput̄s, so that they should have to eat of the object of their worship.

After he had done all this, he turned the bridle of his determination towards Chitōr; and after his arrival in that quarter, he seized, after some fighting, a fort, which was situated at the foot of the Chitōr hill; and slew a number of Rājput̄s there. He was, after this, engaged in preparations for the siege of Chitōr, when the scouts brought the news, that Kōnbhā himself was not in the fort, but had on that day come out of it, and had gone away in the direction of the foot hills, which were situated in that neighbourhood. The Sultān started in pursuit of him; and sent several detachments separately in different directions after him. It so happened, that one of these encountered Kōnbhā, and a great battle took place, in which Kōnbhā was defeated; and entered the fort of Chitōr. Sultān Maḥmūd detached one army to besiege the fort; and himself took up a position in the centre of the country, and sent detachments every day for ravaging, and laying the country waste.

He then summoned Ā'zam Humāyūn Khān Jahān, so that he might take possession of <sup>1</sup> the country belonging to the Rājput̄s, which was situated round about Shādīābād. When Ā'zam Humāyūn arrived at Mandisōr, he fell ill; and surrendered the deposit of life. Sultān Maḥmūd on receiving this news became extremely disconsolate and sorrowful. He wept much, and in his great grief and distress wounded his face. On arrival in the fort of Mandisōr, he sent the body of his father to Shādīābād; and made Tāj Khān, who was the pay-master of the army, its commander; and returned to his own camp.

As the rainy season had now arrived, the Sultān resolved, that he should select an elevated position, and take up his quarters there; and after the end of the rains again go on with the siege of Chitōr. On the night of the 25th of Dhī-ḥijjah, 846 A.H. (April 24th, 1443 A.D.)

---

<sup>1</sup> The MSS. and the lith. ed. agree, but Firishtah says *ولایت جیتور را* تا *که در اطراف عزد سور واقع است متصرف شود* i.e., so that he might occupy the part of the country of Jaitōr, which was situated around Mandisōr. The Cambridge History of India (p. 355) does not say that Sultān Maḥmūd asked his father to occupy the country round Mandisor, but that the latter led an expedition against that place, and there fell ill and died.

Kōnbhā made a night attack with ten thousand cavalry and six thousand infantry, but Sultān Mahmūd had arranged for the protection of his camp with such care and vigilance that he was unable to do anything; and a large number of 1 Rājput̃s were slain. The next night Sultān Mahmūd made a night attack on the army of Kōnbhā, with an army in battle array. Kōnbhā was wounded, and fled towards Chitōr; and many Rājput̃s became food for the sword, and much booty fell into the hands of 2 the followers of Mahmūd. The latter carried out the rites of offering thanks to God, and deferring the capture of the fort of Chitōr to the next year returned to his capital of Shādiābhād for protection and safety.

Towards the end of Dhī-hijjah of the same year, he planned the erection of a college, and a minaret 3 seven stories high, in front of the Hūshang Shāhi *Jāma'* Mosque.

In the year 6849 A.H., an ambassador came from Sultān Mahmūd son of Sultān Ḥaḥīm Sharqi, the ruler of Jaunpūr, with gifts and presents of rare excellence, and after placing them before the Sultān gave a verbal message to the following effect, "Nasir, 4 son of 'Abdul-qādir the governor of Kālpi, has turned his face from the strict path of the law of the Prophet, has adopted the ways of heresy and heterodoxy, has given up the practice of fasting and prayer, and has made over Musalmān women to Hindū *Nāyikās* so that they might teach them the art of dancing. As the governors of Kālpi have from the time of Sultān Hūshang, been nominees of the rulers of Mālwa, it is right and proper, that I should in the first instance reveal all

his circumstances to your right-thinking mind; but if you should not have the leisure to punish and chastise him, you may indicate the fact to me, so that I may chastise him in a way, that may be deterrent to others." Sultān Maḥmūd said in reply, "The greater part of my army has gone to punish the rebels of <sup>1</sup> Mandisōr, and as you have placed the defence of the faith in the forefront of your energies, <sup>2</sup> may your undertaking be of good omen; and it has my approval." In the same *majlis* he bestowed a robe of honour, and the usual money, which had become customary in that age and which had been paid to ambassadors, on the ambassador of Sultān Maḥmūd Sharqī, and granted him permission to return.

When the ambassador arrived at Jaunpūr, and reported (Sultān Maḥmūd Khalji's) reply, Sultān Maḥmūd, on account of his great pleasure and joy, sent twenty elephants as a final present to the Sultān. He then advanced towards Kālpī with a well-equipped army, and <sup>3</sup> expelled Naṣīr (son of) 'Abd-ul-qādir from that country.

And Naṣīr (son of) 'Abd-ul-qādir sent a petition to Maḥmūd Shāh to the following purport, "I have been obedient and submissive to your well wishers from the time of Hūshang Shāh to this day. Now Sultān Maḥmūd Sharqī has, with violence and tyranny, seized this *faqīr's* territory. As you have always been my protector, now also knowing your high threshold to be the altar of my hopes, I have turned (my face) towards the country of Chandēri." Sultān Maḥmūd sent 'Alī Khān with elegant things and presents to Sultān Maḥmūd

<sup>1</sup> The MSS. have *ميوات*, and *سواد*, and the lith. ed. has *منواتر* which all appear to be incorrect. The lith. ed. of Firishtah has *منصور*, and I have adopted it. M. Hidayat Hossain, however, has retained *سواد* in the text-edition.

<sup>2</sup> There is some difficulty about the meaning of the passage, which is written in one MS. as *مبارک باشد کہ قصد مقبول نموده اند*. In the other MS. the word *و* is substituted for *کہ*, and the word *است* for the last two words *اند نموده*. In the lith. ed. the conjunction is *و* and the sentence ends with the words *مقبول*, and both *اند نموده* and *است* are omitted.

<sup>3</sup> The expression in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. as well as in the lith. ed. of Firishtah is *خواجہ دار از ان دیار بیرون کرد* I cannot find out the exact meaning of the word *دار* خواجہ. It would be noticed that it was used in two previous passages.

Sharqī; and begged him that "As Naṣīr K̲h̲ān, son of 'Abd-ul-qādir, has, through your exertions and activities, repented of his evil acts, and has adopted the path of the law of the Prophet; and as he has from the time of the fortunate Sultān Hūshang been under our protection, it is hoped, that accepting and taking into consideration the purport of the text, 'that one who has repented of his sin is as if he had not sinned at all', he would draw the pen of forgiveness over his offences; and would deliver his country back to him." After the arrival of 'Alī K̲h̲ān, Sultān Maḥmūd Sharqī did not give any distinct reply, and passed the time by saying "may be and perhaps."

Maḥmūd Shāh K̲h̲alījī owing to his sense of honour and manliness, considered the protection of Naṣīr (son of) 'Abd-ul-qādir incumbent on his spirits, and started on the 1<sup>2</sup>nd Shawwāl 848, towards Chandēri; and in the neighbourhood of that place 2 Naṣīr K̲h̲ān came and rendered him 3 homage; and 4 (Sultān Maḥmūd then) immediately advanced towards Erij and Bhāndīr. When this news reached Sultān Maḥmūd Sharqī, he came out of the city, and encamped in the territory of Erij; and having seized Mubārak K̲h̲ān, son of Junaid K̲h̲ān, who was the hereditary ruler of that place, took him along with him. Starting from that place he encamped in the broken ground near the river Jamunā, to which there was only a narrow

<sup>1</sup> The corresponding A.D. date is given by Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 212) as January 8th, 1445 A.D., while the Cambridge History of India, page 355, gives January 12th, 1445, as the date on which Sultān Maḥmūd K̲h̲alījī commenced his march towards Chandēri.

<sup>2</sup> He is called Naṣīr Shāh in this place in the MSS., and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah; but more correctly Naṣīr K̲h̲ān in the lith. ed. of the Ṭabaqāt. M. Hidayat Ḥosain has Naṣīr Shāh in the text-edition.

<sup>3</sup> The words ملاقات کرد occur in one MS. after ملازمت نمود but not in the other MS. or in the lith. ed.

<sup>4</sup> The words from چوں to بلا توقف occur in the MS., but are omitted from the lith. ed. There are slight differences in the MS. also; the initial و is omitted in one and the name of the second place is differently spelt in the two MSS. In one it is بهاندیر, which I suppose is Bhāndīr, though there is no dot below the first letter, while in the other it is written as بهدیر, which is probably Bhadnīr. In the lith. ed. of Firishtah it is نهاندیر, Thāndīr. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 212) has Bhandere. The Cambridge History of India mentions Erij, but not Bhāndīr.



The *rājputs* and inhabitants of the town of Erij complained of the oppression and tyranny of Muḥammad Khān, son of Jūmūd Khān. Sultān Mahmūd Khaljī sent Malik-arshad-arq Muzaffar Ibrāhīm, the governor of Chandēri, with a large army to Erij. When he arrived in the neighbourhood, news came that Sultān Mahmūd Sharqī had sent Malik Kālū to attack and destroy him, and had reached the village of <sup>1</sup> Rātah. Malik Muzaffar Ibrāhīm also turned to Rātah and after they had met Malik Kālū fled. The inhabitants of Rātah came and saw Muzaffar Ibrāhīm; <sup>2</sup> he seized them all, and sent them to Chandēri; and again advanced towards Erij. He learnt on the way that Sultān Mahmūd Sharqī had sent the major portion of his army to make a raid on the territory of <sup>3</sup> Barhār, the Rāj whereof was a dependant of Mahmūd Shāh Khaljī. Malik Muzaffar considered the guarding of his (master's) dominions must have precedence over the conquest of Erij, and advanced in that direction; and the Sharqī army, hearing

<sup>1</sup> The name is written as رات and رات in the MS., and رات in the lith. ed., and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 213) calls it Rohut. The Cambridge History of India does not mention the place, or the incidents connected with it.

<sup>2</sup> It is not at all clear why he did so. Firishtah does not mention the incident.

<sup>3</sup> The place is called Barhār in one MS. and in the lith. ed., and برباد Parbād in the other MS. It is not mentioned in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. M. Hidayat Ḥosain has adopted برهارد Parhārūh in the text-edition.

the news, turned back, and went to the town of Rātah. As the war was being prolonged, and Musalmāns belonging to both sides were being wounded and slain, <sup>1</sup>Shaikh Jāfaldah, who was one of the great men of the age, and was famous for revelations and miraculous acts, wrote and sent, with the concurrence of Sultān Maḥmūd Sharqī, a letter to Maḥmūd Shāh Khaljī, on the subject of a peace; and by the exertions of His Holiness the Shaikh, the peace was effected in this way; that Sultān Maḥmūd Sharqī should at once make over the towns of Rātah and Mahōbah to Nasir Khān; and when four months should have elapsed after the return of Maḥmūd Shāh Khaljī, he should deliver to him the territory of Kālpi also. The period of four months was mentioned for this reason, that in that time, the truth about his religion and creed would be disclosed; and on this agreement Maḥmūd Shāh Khaljī returned to Shādīābād.

When he arrived in the neighbourhood of the fort of Ranthambhōr, he transferred the command of it from Bahār Khān to Malik Saif-ud-din; and marching by successive stages encamped on the bank of the river Benāres. As Rāy Kōnbhā did not possess the strength to meet him, he fortified himself in the fort of Mandalgarh; and on the 2nd and 3rd day, the Rājput sallied out of the fort, and exerted themselves bravely. But in the end, they came in with weakness and humility; and agreed to pay tribute. Sultān Khālji, owing to the exigencies of the time, agreed to a peace, and returned (to his own dominions).

In a short time, having newly equipped his army, he advanced with the object of capturing the fort of Biyāna. When he arrived within two *farsangs* of that place, <sup>1</sup> Saiyid Muhammad Khān, the governor of the place, sent his son Aūhad Khān to wait on him; and sent one hundred horses, and one *lakh* of *tanbas* in cash as tribute. Mahmūd Shāh having honoured him with a special robe of honour, gave him permission to go back. He also sent a gold embroidered *gabā* (robe) and a head-dress decorated with gems, a gold belt and horses with saddles and bridles adorned with gold for Muhammad Khān himself. The latter put on the *gabā*, and opened his mouth in praise of Mahmūd Shāh, and had the public prayer read and the coins struck <sup>2</sup> in his name. The Sultān on hearing this news returned from the place where he was. On the way he captured the town of <sup>3</sup> Alhanpūr which is situated near Ranthambhōr. He next <sup>4</sup> sent eight thousand

---

<sup>1</sup> He is called Mahmūd Khān in one MS. In the other he is called Mahmūd Khān in one place and Muhammad Khān in the other. The lith. ed. and the lith. ed. of Firishtah call him Muhammad Khān.

<sup>2</sup> It appears from Firishtah that he did so by removing the name of the *Bādshāh* of Dehli. The Cambridge History of India, page 356, says Muhammad Khān substituted the name of Mahmūd Khālji for that of 'Ālam Shāh of Dehli. As a matter of fact, the Sultān of Dehli at this time was Sultān 'Ālā-ud-dīn, who was succeeded by Bahlūl Lūdī, and no 'Ālam Shāh reigned in Dehli at that time.

<sup>3</sup> The name of the town is variously given. The MSS. have آهانپور Alhanpūr, and the lith. ed. has پاھتور Pahtūr, while the lith. ed. of Firishtah has نیر Nēwar. Col. Briggs has the *fort* (not the *town*) of Anundpoor, and the Cambridge History of India, page 356, cuts the Gordian knot by calling it "a minor fortress."

<sup>4</sup> Under Tāj Khān, according to Firishtah, Col. Briggs and the Cambridge History of India.

horsemen and twenty-five elephants, with the object of capturing the fort of Chitōr; and after taking one *lakh* and five and twenty thousand *tankas* from the Rāja of Kōtah in the way of tribute returned to Shādiābād.

In the year 854 A.H., 1450 A.D., <sup>1</sup> Gangdās, the Rāja of the fort of Chāmpānir sent him tribute, and submitted that, "Sultān Muḥammad, son of Sultān Aḥmad, is besieging the hill of Chāmpānir; as this slave has always carried his prayers to Your Majesty, he now hopes for aid and support." Sultān Maḥmūd turned his attention to give him help. On the way news came that <sup>2</sup> Sultān Quṭb-ud-dīn, son of Sultān Muḥammad Gujrātī, had come towards Īdar, with the object of demanding tribute from the Rāja of that place. Sultān Maḥmūd considering him to be <sup>3</sup> weak, started towards <sup>4</sup> Bārāsīnōr. On hearing this news Sultān Muḥammad, as his <sup>5</sup> baggage animals had become lame and disabled, burnt his tents and other equipages

and retired towards Aḥmadābād. When Sultān Maḥmūd received this information, he also turned back from the way, and encamped on the bank of the Mahindrī. Gangdās came to him at this place, bringing with him thirteen *lakhs* of *tankas* in cash, and some horses in the way of tribute. Sultān Maḥmūd bestowed on him a gold embroidered robe (*qabā*) in the same *majlis*; and gave him permission to go back; and himself returned to his capital of Shādiābād. On the way, he gave permission to Rāy Bir, Rāja of Īdar, to go back, after bestowing on him, as a reward, five elephants and twenty-one horses and three *lakhs* of *tankas* in cash. He remained for a time at Shādiābād and occupied himself with the affairs of his dominions and army.

In the year 855 A.H., (1451 A.D.), he advanced with more than one hundred thousand horses to conquer Gujrāt and having passed <sup>1</sup> Ghātī Bawālī, besieged the town of Sultānpūr. Malik 'Alā-ud-dīn Suhrāb, who was the deputy of <sup>2</sup> Sultān Quṭb-ud-dīn for some days sallied out of the fort and fought bravely. (But) when he <sup>3</sup> became hopeless of receiving any reinforcement he begged for quarter and joined Sultān Maḥmūd. The latter sent his family and <sup>4</sup> children to the fort of Mandū; and made him swear that he would never turn his face from his master. He then gave him the title of Mubārīz K̲h̲ān, and made him the commander of the army; and advanced towards Aḥmadābād. On the way news came that <sup>5</sup> Sultān Muḥammad had surrendered the deposit of his life; and his son Quṭb-ud-dīn had taken his place. Sultān Maḥmūd, in spite of the fact that his object was the destruction of the mansion of Sultān Muḥammad's government, owing to his great humanity, assumed

<sup>1</sup> The name is written as گهالي بوالي, and گهاني توالي in the MSS., and as گابني نوالي in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has کاتي نوالي. I have not been able to find the name elsewhere. M. Hidayat Ḥosain has adopted کباتي بوالي in the text-edition.

<sup>2</sup> But see below where it will be seen that Sultān Muḥammad was yet alive.

<sup>3</sup> شد in one MS., and in the lith ed.; but گشت in the other MS.

<sup>4</sup> عيال او اطفالش را in one MS., and in the lith. ed.; and عيال و اطفال اورا in the other MS.

<sup>5</sup> One MS. inserts سلطان احمد after سلطان محمد, while the other quite erroneously substitutes سلطان احمد for سلطان محمد.

mourning; and in accordance with a custom of the time distributed *pān* and *Sharbat* (betel and sweet drinks) to the *amīrs* and learned men in his army. He also wrote a letter to Sultān Quṭb-ud-dīn, offering him condolences on his father's death, and congratulations on his accession. At the same time, however, he laid waste the town of Barōda, and left no stone unturned in the matter of plundering and seizing the inhabitants. He made prisoners of some thousands of Musalmāns and *Kāfirs*; and after halting for some days in that town, advanced towards Aḥmadābād.

At this time, Malik 'Alā-ud-dīn Suhṛāb, who had been waiting for a time and opportunity, fled and went to Sultān Quṭb-ud-dīn. <sup>1</sup> It would appear, that when he took the oath, and engaged that he would not be false to the salt of his master, he had his old (original) master in his mind: and owing to his great regard for his salt had abandoned his family and children. Sultān Maḥmūd marched by successive stages, and encamped at <sup>2</sup> Kaparbanj, which was situated at a distance of 25 *karōhs* from Aḥmadābād. Sultān Quṭb-ud-dīn halted at the village of Kḥānpūr, which was three *karōhs* from Kaparbanj. For some days the two *Bādshāhs* confronted each other; and on the night of <sup>3</sup> the last day of Ṣafar in the afore-mentioned year, Sultān Maḥmūd mounted his horse with the determination of making a night attack, and came out of his camp. But he missed the way, and remained all night seated on his horse in an open plain. Early in the morning he placed the army of Sārangpūr on his right wing, and entrusted the command of it to his eldest son Ghīyāth-ud-dīn; and nominated the *amīrs* of Chandēri to the left wing and arrayed it under the command of <sup>4</sup> Qadam Kḥān, who was his younger son.

<sup>1</sup> There are differences in the readings here. The MSS. have, with slight variations, the reading I have adopted; the lith. ed. has a very imperfect reading.

<sup>2</sup> سرکج Sarkaj in the text-edition.

<sup>3</sup> The date is صفر سلخ in the MSS. and in the lith. eds., both of the Ṭabaqāt and Firishtah. سلخ as applied to a month means towards the close of, and in respect of a particular day means the last day. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 217) gives the 1st of Suffur, 856, as the date of the proposed night attack and gives the 10th of February, 1453, as the corresponding date of the Christian era. Both the date and the year of the Hijrī era and consequently the date and the year of the Christian era are incorrect.

<sup>4</sup> غزنين خان in the text-edition.

He placed himself in the centre of the army and commenced the battle. Sultān Quṭb-ud-dīn also placing the army of Gujrāt in battle array advanced to the (battle-) field. The vanguard of Sultān Quṭb-ud-dīn's army fled before the vanguard of Sultān Maḥmūd's army, and joined Sultān Quṭb-ud-dīn. Muẓaffar Khān, who was one of the great *amīrs* of Chandēri, separated himself from the left wing of Sultān Maḥmūd's army, and attacked the right wing of Sultān Quṭb-ud-dīn's army; and its soldiers being unable to withstand the attack turned their faces in flight. Muẓaffar Khān pursued them as far as Sultān Quṭb-ud-dīn's camp; and his men stretching their hands to plunder and ravage entered the treasury in the camp, and loading all their elephants with treasure sent them at once to their own camp. When the elephants returned, and they wanted to lead and send them a second time, they heard that a detachment of Sultān Quṭb-ud-dīn's army finding Shāhzāda <sup>1</sup> Qadam Khān's troops to be weak and in distress had attacked them, and as they were unable to withstand them, they carried away their lives <sup>2</sup> on one foot (*i.e.*, with much difficulty). Muẓaffar Khān withdrawing his hand from plunder went into a corner. Sultān Maḥmūd was amazed at seeing his army dispersed and his left wing routed, and stood with two hundred horsemen on the field of bravery, and acting as an expert archer, as long as he had any arrows left in his quiver, gave proof of his great courage. At this time Sultān Quṭb-ud-dīn came out of the corner, in which he was concealed, with a detachment in battle array and confronted Sultān Maḥmūd. The latter having exerted himself to the utmost retired to his camp, with (only) thirteen men. Sultān Quṭb-ud-dīn considered this victory a great gift of God, and did not engage in pursuit. Eighty-one elephants and an immense quantity of booty fell into his hands.

Sultān Maḥmūd remained on horseback in his place till nightfall. When five or six thousand horsemen had collected round him, he started for Mandū at midnight. On the way, his army was badly harassed by *kōlis* and *bhīls*. Sultān Maḥmūd did not, from the time of the rising of the sun of his greatness and up to the end of the period

<sup>1</sup> ندي خان in the text-edition.

<sup>2</sup> The MSS. have تېک پا and تېک پا, and the lith. ed. has تېک پا. I cannot find the meaning of تېک پا; تېک پا of course means one foot.

of his reign, suffer any defeat, except this. When he arrived at Mandū, and the damages sustained by his army had been repaired, <sup>1</sup> he appointed Sultān Ghiyāth-ud-dīn, who was his true-born son to raid the town of Sūrat, which had been founded on the bank of the Tāptī, and was one of the famous ports of Gujrāt. Sultān Ghiyāth-ud-dīn returned after having ravaged a number of places pertaining to Sūrat. It so happened that (at this time) <sup>2</sup> information of the deceit and treachery and hostilities of Nizām-ul-mulk, the *vazīr*, and his sons, reached Sultān Maḥmūd; and by his order they were punished.

In the year 857 A.H., 1453 A.D., Sultān Maḥmūd confirmed his determination to conquer the country of Mārwar; but as he was not assured in his mind from the side of Sultān Qutb-ud-dīn, he thought it advisable that he should, in the first instance, conclude a treaty with the latter; and after that undertake the conquest of Kōnbhā's dominions. He kept this hidden in his mind, and gave orders for the equipment of his army; and went from Shādiābād to the town of Dhār. He sent Tāj Khān from that place with a well-equipped army to the border of Gujrāt, so that he might introduce the matter of the treaty. Tāj Khān wrote letters to the *vazīrs* of Sultān Qutb-ud-dīn; and sending them by the hands of eloquent emissaries, conveyed the message, that disputes and hostility between the two sides were a cause of injury to the people; and peace and amity the cause of safety and prosperity. After much discussion Sultān Qutb-ud-dīn expressed his consent to a treaty of peace, and great and pious men from both sides having intervened, strengthened the treaty by engagements and oaths. It was settled, that the Qutbī army should plunder and ravage such parts of Kōnbhā's dominions as were contiguous to Gujrāt, and Maḥmūd Shāh should take possession of the country of Mēwār and Ajmīr and all the neighbouring countries; and whenever necessary either of the parties should not refuse to aid and help the other.

---

<sup>1</sup> Firishtah lith. ed. agrees, but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 218) says that "Gheias-ood-deen, with the right wing of the army, fled to Surat, where he plundered the country" etc.

<sup>2</sup> The word خبری appears to be required after اتفاق , but does not appear either in the MSS., or in the lith. ed. It is in the lith. ed. of Firishtah, and I have inserted it in the text.



In the year 858 A.H., 1454 A.D., Sultān Maḥmūd advanced to punish the rebellious Rājputs, who had raised the standard of recusancy and revolt in the territories of <sup>1</sup> Hārautī; and made many Rājputs in the town of <sup>2</sup> Mahōlī food for the sword; and having seized their children and families sent them to Mandū. From that place he advanced towards Biyāna; and when he arrived near it, and as Dāūd Khān, the governor of Biyāna sent much tribute, and came in the way of loyalty and sincerity, he left the territory in his possession. He also, by his excellent exertions, changed a <sup>3</sup> dispute, which had existed between Yūsuf Khān Hindaunī and the governor of Biyāna, into friendship and attachment. At the time of his return, he left the government of the forts of Rantambhōr and Hārautī in the charge of Qadam Khān who had the title of <sup>4</sup> Sultān 'Alā-ud-dīn; and spread the shadow of peace and hope on the residents of Shādīābād.

In the course of the same year, Sikandar Khān and Jalāl Khān Bukhārī, who were among the great *amīrs* of Sultān 'Alā-ud-dīn Bahmanī Dakinī, sent petitions and incited Sultān Maḥmūd to seize the fort of Māhūr, which was one of the great forts of Berār. The Sultān advanced towards Māhūr <sup>5</sup> by way of Hūshangābād. Sikandar Khān came and waited on him in the neighbourhood of

<sup>1</sup> The name is written as *عادوتی* in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. In the lith. ed. of *Firishtah* it is written as *هاروتی*. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 219) has Kerowly. The Cambridge History of India, page 356, does not give the name of the country, but calls the people the "Hāra Rājputs".

<sup>2</sup> The town is called *مهولی* and *مرهولی* in the MS., and *مهولی* in the lith. ed. *Firishtah* lith. ed. has *مهوتی* Mahōtī. Neither Col. Briggs nor the Cambridge History of India mentions the name.

<sup>3</sup> The word which I have translated as "dispute" is written in the MS. as *نقازی*, and *لقازی*. In the lith. ed. it is *نقاوی*, and in the lith. ed. of *Firishtah* it is *نقاسی*. None of these words have any meaning in the dictionary which is quite appropriate. I believe "dispute", "railing at", than the "dandying words", which is the meaning of *نقازی* as the nearest. M. Hidayat Ḥosain has retained *نقازی* in the text-edition.

<sup>4</sup> Both MSS. have Sultān *Ghiyāth*-ud-dīn. This is incorrect. Sultān *Ghiyāth*-ud-dīn was the title of the elder son. Qadam Khān's title was 'Alā-ud-dīn. *Firishtah* lith. ed. has *فدای خان* Fidāi Khān instead of Qadam Khān; and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 219) has Fidwy Khan.

<sup>5</sup> The MSS. have *از راه هوشنگا باد* instead of *از دار الہک ہوشنگا باد*.

Maḥmūdābād. When he laid siege to Māhūr, Sultān 'Alā-ud-dīn came with an army, as numerous as the stars and as splendid as the sky, to aid the besieged garrison. Sultān Maḥmūd finding that he had not the strength to meet him turned back. The pen, perfumed with musk, has narrated these incidents clearly and in detail, in the section about the Bahmanī Sultāns.

At the time of his return news came from the <sup>1</sup> enemies, that Mubārak Khān, the ruler of Asīr, had invaded the country of Baklāna which is situated between Gujrāt and the Deccan, and owed fealty and allegiance to Maḥmūd Shāh. The latter, considering it incumbent on his spirit to protect and favour the ruler of the country, turned the reins of his determination in the direction of Baklāna; and sent Iqbāl Khān and Yūsuf Khān in advance of himself. Mubārak Khān came with a large army to oppose, but fled after a massacre. Sultān Maḥmūd returned to Shādiābād, after raiding some villages and towns in the territory of Asīr.

In the year 858 A.H., news was brought to Sultān Maḥmūd, that the son of Rāy Bābū, the Rāja of Baklāna, wanted to come to him; but Mubārak Khān, the ruler of Asīr had invaded his country, and was laying it waste, and was preventing him from coming. Sultān Maḥmūd sent Sultān Ghiyāth-ud-dīn on wings of speed to put him (Mubārak Khān) down. When the news reached the latter, he turned back and went to his own country. A son of Bābū came with much tribute, and received favours; and having obtained permission to return, went back proud and happy to his own country; and Sultān Ghiyāth-ud-dīn went towards Rantambhōr.

About this time, the Sultān advanced towards Chitōr. Kōnbhā met him in the way of affability and gentleness, and sent a quantity of <sup>2</sup> coined gold and silver as tribute. As the coins bore Kōnbhā's

<sup>1</sup> The word is مترددین in one MS. and in the lith. ed.; and متردین in the other MS. The only meaning of مترددین that can at all apply is enemies, but even that is not appropriate. متردین cannot be found in the dictionary. Firishtah leaves out the words مترددین از in the corresponding passage; and gives the full name of Mubārak Khān as Mirān Mubārak Shāh Fārūqī.

<sup>2</sup> One MS. has زر و نقره مسکوک پیشکش فرستاد. The other has زر و نقره مسکوک پیش فرستاد both these readings are partly incorrect. The reading in the lith. ed. appears to be correct and I have retained it.

stamp, they became the cause of an increase of Maḥmūd's wrath; and <sup>1</sup> he returned them; and his men stretched their hands in the way of plunder and rapine; and did not leave a vestige of cultivation and population. He also appointed Maṣṣūr-ul-mulk to lay waste the country of Mandisōr. And with the object of leaving *thānadārs* there, he wanted to found a town of the name of Kḥaljpūr in the centre of the country. On hearing this, Kōnbhā came in a state of distress and humility and sent a message to the Sultān, that he was prepared to send any amount of tribute that the latter might demand, and after that would never transgress the path of devotion and loyalty on the condition that the Sultān would abandon the project of building Kḥaljpūr. As the rains were approaching, Sultān Maḥmūd took as much tribute as pleased his heart, and turned towards Shādiābād. After remaining there for a time, he again advanced in the year 859 A.H., 1454 A.D., with the object of conquering the country of Mandisōr. On arriving in that neighbourhood, he sent detachments in different directions, and himself took up a position in the centre of the country. Every day news of a fresh victory came to him, and he performed the rites of offering thanks to God.

It so happened that one day a petition came from a detachment, which had been sent in the direction of Hārautī, to the purport that, the beginning of the rising of the sun of Islām in the country of Hindūstān was from the horizon of Ajmīr, and His Holiness the most learned of the sects <sup>2</sup> Shaikh Mu'in-ud-dīn Ḥasan Sanjarī was at rest in that place; and now as it had come into the possession of the *Kāfirs*, there was no vestige left there of Islām or Musalmāns. As the purport of this petition was received, Sultān Maḥmūd turned in the direction of Ajmīr that very day; and after successive marches,

---

<sup>1</sup> Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 221) says in a note that Chittoor was never subjugated by the kings of either Guzerat or Malwa; and therefore Sooltan Mahmood did not return the tribute, because the coins bore Koombho's stamp, but because he did not consider it to be large enough. It appears to me that Sultān Maḥmūd did not admit the independence of Rānā Kōnbhā, who was paying tribute off and on; and, therefore, resented the fact that the tribute sent contained coins which bore the Rānā's stamp; and he was probably also dissatisfied with the amount of the tribute.

<sup>2</sup> The Cambridge History of India, page 357, calls him Shaikh Mu'in-ud-dīn Chishtī.

encamped opposite the tomb, which was the receptacle of light, and asked for help from the spirit of the *Khwājah*, may his tomb be sanctified! (He then) ordered the *bakhshī* (pay-master) of the army, that he should, in concert with the *amīrs*, reconnoitre round the fort and distribute the batteries. At this time <sup>1</sup> Gajādhar, who was the commander of the garrison, sallied out with a body of renowned Rājput̃s to give battle. He was, however, unable to withstand the assaults of Maḥmūd's troops, and retired again into the fort. After that bloody skirmishes were carried on for four days. On the 5th day, Gajādhar again came out with all his troops, and was slain in the full swing of the fight. A body of Maḥmūd Shāh's soldiers, being mixed with those who were fleeing, got inside the gates; and the conquest of the fort fell to the lot of the Musalmāns. In every lane there lay heaps of Rājput̃s that had been slain. Sultān Maḥmūd, having carried out the rites of offering his thanks to God, attained to the honour of circumambulating the grave of the great saint; and made plans for the erection of a grand mosque. He conferred the title of Saif Khān on Khwājah Na'mat-ul-lah, and entrusted the rule of the fort to his charge. He made the attendants of that holy place happy by bestowing rewards and stipends on them; and then returning towards the fort of Mandargarh, encamped after successive marches on the bank of the river Banūs. He nominated *amīrs* to different points round the fort. Kōnbhā also sent out his army from the fort dividing it into three detachments. The division, which confronted Tāj Khān, and that which was opposed to 'Alī Khān, fought with arrows and lances and there was <sup>2</sup> a great battle; and a large number of Maḥmūd

---

<sup>1</sup> The name is written as كجادر, Kajādhar, in the MSS. as well as in the lith. ed.; and as Gajādhar in the lith. ed. of *Firishtah*. This latter is of course correct. Gajādhar is a corruption of Sanskrit Gadādhar, *i.e.*, one who bears the mace. Col. Briggs has got Gungadhur Ray, which may be derived from Gangādharā—a name of Siva—meaning one who carries the goddess or river Gangā. The Cambridge History of India, page 357, has Gajānhar, which has no meaning at all. M. Hidayat Ḥosain has retained كجادر in the text-edition.

<sup>2</sup> Col. Briggs (vol. IV, page 223, footnote) suggests that this was the battle which was commemorated as a great victory obtained by Rana Koombho over Sooltan Mahmood on the superb column which the former erected; but there is very little similarity between this battle and the victory claimed

Shāh's troops were slain, while an innumerable host of Rājput̃s became food for the sword. When the sovereign of the stars turned his face from the arch of <sup>1</sup> the fourth heaven towards his private chamber (*i.e.*, the sunset), the two parties took up their quarters in their respective stations. In the morning, the *amīrs* and *vazīrs* collected in the royal pavilion, and submitted that as during that year the troops had been fighting repeated campaigns and the rainy season was near, it would be fitting and proper, if he would rest and repose for a few days in the capital city of Shādiābād, in order to repair the damage and injury to the army; and make after the rains, with a fully equipped army, a king-like attempt to capture the fort. Sultān Maḥmūd returned and rested for some days.

On the 26th Muḥarram 861 A.H., 23rd December, 1456, the Sultān marched with a great army to capture the fort of Mandalgarh. In the neighbourhood of Mēwār, the armies of Nāgōr and Ajmir and Hārautī came and joined him. From that place they marched together to besiege Mandalgarh. On the way, wherever they saw a

---

by the Rājput̃s. According to the Rājput̃ Annals, the victory took place in 1440 A.D., while the date of this battle was 1455 or 1456, 15 or 16 years later; while to take one of the incidents, Sultān Maḥmūd was said to have been taken prisoner, and kept in confinement for six months, and then released; see note 6, pages 512, 513. There is no mention of this in the Musalmān histories; and it is scarcely possible that such a thing should have occurred without being noted.

The Cambridge History of India, page 357, does not mention this battle at all, and the account given by it is entirely different. According to it, "the siege was opened and the approaches carried up to the walls. On October 19th, 1457, the place was carried by assault, with great slaughter., etc., etc." There is no mention of Rānū Kōnbhā and of his army; and instead of the retreat mentioned by Nizām-ud-din and Firishtah, we have Sultān Maḥmūd advancing towards Chitor, and sending columns in different directions to harass the Rājput̃s and to reduce them to subjection. Later on, however, on page 361, when giving a summary of the qualities and achievements of Sultān Maḥmūd it says "The more famous column of victory at Chitor is said to commemorate victories over Maḥmūd of Gujarāt and Maḥmūd of Mālwa. If this is so it, 'like some tall bully lifts its head and lies'."

<sup>1</sup> The MSS. and the lith. ed. of Firishtah have طاق فلک چهارم the arch of the fourth heaven or sky, and I have accordingly adopted it; but the reading in the lith. ed. of the Ṭabaqāt طارم چهارم, which has the same meaning, sounds very well, and I had a mind to retain it.



When he arrived in that neighbourhood, he sent Shāhzāda Sultān Ghīyāth-ud-dīn to raid and ravage the countries of Kilwārah <sup>1</sup> and Dilwārah. The Shāhzāda laid the country waste, captured many prisoners, and returned under the wings of help and safety. After some days Shāhzāda <sup>2</sup> Qadam Khān and Tāj Khān were nominated to attempt the capture of the fort of Būndī. When the Shāhzāda arrived in the vicinity of the fort, the Rājput̃s came out of it and commenced a fight. They exerted themselves to the best of their ability, but being in the end routed, became food for the sword; and a number of them having thrown themselves into the ditch were taken prisoners. On the first day of the attack they captured the fort by the strength of their arms, and their bravery and courage. The Shāhzāda having offered thanks for this great gift in the best way, left one of his trusted chiefs in that place; and with victory and triumph, returned to the capital city of Shādīābād in the foot steps of his father and patron.

In the year 863 A.H., 1458 A.D., (the Sultān) <sup>3</sup> again mounted to punish and chastise the Rājput̃s. When he encamped in the village of <sup>4</sup> Ahār, he appointed Sultān Ghīyāth-ud-dīn and <sup>5</sup> Qadam Khān to raid the countries of Kilwārah and Dilwārah. They ravaged that country, and also raided the country round Kōnbhalmīr. When they waited on their father, and Sultān Ghīyāth-ud-dīn dilated on the praise of that fort, Sultān Maḥmūd advanced the next day towards it. On the way he demolished temples and traversed the different stages. When he encamped in the vicinity of Kōnbhalmīr, he mounted his horse one day, and went to the top of a hill which was situated on its eastern side, and reconnoitred the city. He then declared that the

<sup>1</sup> One MS. and the lith. ed. have Kilwārah and Dilwārah, while the other MS. has Kilwārah and Malwārah.

<sup>2</sup> The text-edition has فتن خان.

<sup>3</sup> One MS. omits the words بتاديب و گوشمال راجپوتان سوارى نمود - و چون بتاديب و گوشمال راجپوتان سوارى نمود - و چون بتاديب و گوشمال راجپوتان سوارى نمود and has instead نامزد فرمود بموضع اهار فرود آمد then as in the other MS. and in the lith. ed. and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah.

<sup>4</sup> One MS. and the lith. ed. and the lith. ed. of Firishtah have بموضع اهار, but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 225) has the town of D'har.

<sup>5</sup> The name is variously written as Qadam Khān, Fidāi Khān, and Fidwī Khān.

capture of the fort would not be possible without a siege lasting some years. The next day he started from that place and advanced towards Dūngarpūr. When he encamped on the bank of the Dūngarpūr reservoir, <sup>1</sup> Rāy Syām Dās, the Rāja of the place fled, and took shelter in the foot-hills; and coming out again from that place in great humility and distress gave a tribute of two *lakhs* of *tankas* and twenty-one horses. The Sultān then returned to his capital of Shādīābād.

In Muḥarram 866 A.H., September 1461 A.D., he advanced by rapid stages to conquer the country of the Deccan at the instigation of <sup>2</sup> Malik Nizām-ul-mulk Ghūrī. <sup>3</sup> When he crossed the river Narbada, the scouts brought the news, that Mubārak Khān, the ruler of Asīr, had surrendered the deposit of his life. And Ghāzī Khān, his son, who bore the title of 'Ādil Khān, had taken his place. In the beginning of his rule he had stretched out his hands of <sup>4</sup> tyranny from the sleeve of oppression, had unjustly ordered <sup>5</sup> Saiyid Kamāl-ud-dīn and Saiyid Sultān to be slain, and had laid waste the houses of the victims. After some days their brother named Saiyid Jalāl-ud-dīn came to Sultān Maḥmūd praying for justice. The latter, in order to help him, determined to chastise 'Ādil Khān, and with this intention marched towards Asīr. 'Ādil Khān in his helplessness and humility sent one of the grandsons (descendants) of Qutb 'Ālam

<sup>1</sup> He is called Rāy Syām Dās in one MS. and Rāy Sām Dās in the other, and Sāmī Dās in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has Rāy Sām Dās, and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, page 225) has Sham Das. I have adopted Syām Das, as it is nearest to the Sanskrit name.

<sup>2</sup> Firishtah and Col. Briggs agree; see also page 87 in the account of Nizām Shāh Bahmanī, from which it would appear, that the invasion was at the instigation of Malik Nizām-ul-mulk Ghūrī; but the Cambridge History of India, page 357, says that Humāyūn Shāh caused Malik Nizām-ul-mulk Ghūrī to be assassinated; and it was at the instance of his family, who escaped to Māndū, that Sultān Maḥmūd Khalji invaded the Deccan.

<sup>3</sup> The Cambridge History of India, page 358, dismisses the matter of the advance on Asīr, with the rather inadequate and misleading statement, "composed a recent quarrel with 'Ādil Khān II of Khāndesh."

<sup>4</sup> Both MSS. have ظلم, but the lith. ed. and the lith. ed. of Firishtah have نظم.

<sup>5</sup> Col. Briggs (vol. IV, pp. 225, 226) has "Syud Kumal and Syud Sooltan, two of the most respectable and holy persons of the age," but I cannot find his authority for doing so.



Shaikh Farid-ud-dīn Mas'ūd Shakarganj to wait on him, and sending some tribute, prayed for the pardon of his offences. As Sultān Maḥmūd knew that the arrow of the plan of no conqueror of forts had ever reached the battlements of the strong bastions of Asir; and besides the real object of this expedition was the conquest of the Deccan, he drew the pen of forgiveness over the volume of 'Ādil Khān's offences; and having given him some advice, turned towards the country of Berār and Elichpūr.

On his arrival in the town of Bālāpūr, his scouts brought the news that the *vazīrs* of <sup>1</sup> Nizām Shāh had summoned and collected the troops from the different frontiers; and having drawn two *crores* of *tankas* from the treasury, had disbursed it, in the way of help to their expenses, to the *amīrs* and the commanders; and they had come out of the city of Bīdar with a large army and one hundred and fifty elephants of mountain-like size; and were waiting for the appearance of secret hidden in the providence of God, may His greatness be glorified! Sultān Maḥmūd, on hearing this news, put his troops in order, and by repeated marches arrived within three *farsangs* of Nizām Shāh. <sup>2</sup> The *vazīrs* placed the eight year old Nizām Shāh

<sup>1</sup> The eight years old son of the tyrant Humāyūn Shāh, who had in the meantime succeeded him.

<sup>2</sup> There are some differences in the readings. One MS. has وزراء نظام شاه ووزرای نظام شاه را سوار کردند, while the other has هشت ساله را سوار کردند and the lith. ed. has the same reading as the first MS., with the difference that it has وزرای instead of وزراء. I have adopted the reading of the first MS. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 226) says that the young king was placed on an elephant; but the use of the word عنان bridle, shows that this is not correct. The account of the battle as given in the Cambridge History of India, page 358, is somewhat misleading. It is said there that, "when the two armies met, that of the Deccan got some slight advantage, but the precipitate action of a slave named Sikandar Khān, who had charge of the person of the child king, decided the fate of the day." As a matter of fact the Deccan army gained a decisive victory and the Mālwa army fled and was pursued for two *karōhs*, and Sultān Maḥmūd's camp was plundered; and the fate of the day was not decided by the precipitate action of the person in charge of the child king; but as so often happened in other battles, was due to the victorious troops having dispersed in search of plunder, and Sultān Maḥmūd coming out of ambush with a body of fresh troops at the psychological moment. The person who took away the young king towards Bīdar was not, according to the Ṭabaqāt and Firishtah, Sikandar

on a horse; and raising the royal umbrella over his head placed the bridle of the horse in the hand of Khwājah Jahān Malik Shāh Turk. The command of the left wing was entrusted to Malik Nizām-ul-mulk Turk, and of the right wing to Khwājah Maḥmūd Gilānī, who had the title of Malik-ut-tujjār. When the two *Bādshāhs* arrived in front of each other Malik-ut-tujjār acting with great quickness fell on the left wing of Sultān Maḥmūd's army; and both Mahābat Khān, the governor of Chandērī, and Zahir-ul-mulk, the *vazīr*, who were the commanders of it were slain; and a great defeat fell on the Mandū army, so that it was pursued to a distance of two *karōhs*; and Sultān Maḥmūd's camp was plundered.

At this time Sultān Maḥmūd, who had betaken himself to a corner, and was waiting for an opportunity (saw that) most of the *Dakinis* were engaged in plundering, and Nizām-ul-mulk was standing with only a few men round him, appeared with twelve thousand horsemen from behind Nizām Shāh's army. Khwājah Jahān Turk, who was the leader of the centre of the army, turned round; and seizing the bridle of Nizām Shāh's horse turned towards the city of Bīdar. The tables were now turned; and the men who had gone away in search of plunder were deprived of the beautiful capital of their lives.

Malka-i-Jahān, the mother of Nizām Shāh, having suspicion of deceit and treachery, left Mallū Khān to guard the city of Bīdar, and went away herself to Firūzābād, taking her son with her. From that place she sent a letter to Sultān Maḥmūd Gujrātī, and asked for his help and reinforcements. And Sultān Maḥmūd followed on and besieged Bīdar. When the people having run away gathered round Nizām Shāh at Firūzābād, and the news was received that Sultān Maḥmūd Gujrātī, who had determined to help Nizām Shāh with a huge army, would be soon arriving: Sultān Maḥmūd, having held a consultation, decided in the end, that as the air had become hot, and the month of Ramaḍān had drawn near, it would be best and

---

Khān, but Khwājah Jahān Turk. It is true that in the letter, which Nizām Shāh or his mother or his ministers wrote to Sultān Maḥmūd Gujrātī they said that Sikandar Khān and Khwājah Jahān carried him off to Bīdar; but not till an arrow from Sultān Maḥmūd's army hit the elephant on which Sikandar Khān was riding, and the animal became unruly, so that Sikandar Khān's action can scarcely be described as precipitate (see note 1, pp. 87-89).

most proper, that he should defer the conquest of the country till the next year, and should then return, and with this pretext, he started on the following day for his own territory.

Again in the year 867 A.H., 1462 A.D., as he had the conquest of the Deccan in his mind, he again equipped his army, and encamped at <sup>1</sup> Naṣratābād Na'lcha; and he was still there, when a petition of Shīrāz-ul-mulk the *thānadār* of the fort of Kehrla arrived with the information, that Nizām Shāh Dakinī had sent Nizām-ul-mulk with a large army to attack the *thāna* of Kehrla; and on the way news came that Nizām-ul-mulk Turk, having arrived, had attacked the fort of Kehrla; and also that when Nizām-ul-mulk had arrived in the neighbourhood of the fort, Sirāj-ul-mulk was intoxicated, and had no notice of what was happening; but his son came out of the fort, and after putting up some fight fled. <sup>2</sup> Nizām-ul-mulk, owing to his great pride and haughtiness, did not occupy himself in arranging the affairs of the place. Sultān Maḥmūd, on receiving this news, sent Maqbūl Khān with four thousand horsemen in the direction of the fort; and himself advanced towards Daulatābād to have his revenge. On the way, the adherents of the Rāy <sup>3</sup> Sirkaja and the *vakils* (representatives) of the Rāy of Jājnagar brought five hundred and thirty elephants as tribute. Sultān Maḥmūd bestowed robes of honour and rewards on them, and gave them permission to return. When he encamped in the village of Khalifa-ābād, one of the servants

<sup>1</sup> Both the MSS. have نصرت آباد نعلچہ but the lith. ed. has only نعلچہ; while Firishtah lith. ed. has ظفر آباد نعلچہ. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 228) has Nalcha. The Cambridge History of India does not mention the incidents connected with Kehrla.

<sup>2</sup> This is the version of Nizām-ul-mulk's proceedings in the Ṭabaqāt, both in the MSS. and in the lith. ed.; but Firishtah has a different account. According to him, Nizām-ul-mulk entered the fort with the troops which were fleeing, and took possession of it, but was murdered the same day by some Rājput foot soldiers. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 228) makes the matter clearer, by saying that "the place had fallen into the hands of Nizam-ool-Moolk; but that he, having exercised excessive tyranny towards the inhabitants had been put to death by a party of Rajpoot infantry." The Cambridge History of India, page 359, mentions the fact of Nizām-ul-mulk's occupation of Kehrla but does not mention his death.

<sup>3</sup> The word is written سورکجه in the MSS. and in the lith. ed., and also in the lith. ed. of Firishtah, but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 228) has Surgooja.

of the *Amīr-ul-mu'minīn* (the *amīr* of the Musalmāns) *Mustanjad Billāh Yūsuf bin 'Abbāsī* brought for him a mandate conferring imperial rule, under a robe of chieftainship from Egypt. In his great joy and delight he carried out the rites of welcoming the servants of the Khalifa, treated them with great honour, and bestowed on them horses with jewelled saddles and bridles and embroidered robes of honour.

When he arrived on the frontier of Daulatābād (they) informed him that Sultān Maḥmūd Gujrātī had come out of his capital and was advancing towards the place. Sultān Maḥmūd advanced towards the fort of <sup>1</sup> Mālkōnda; and having raided and ravaged some villages and hamlets returned to his capital of Shādīābād by way of Gōndwāra. He rested there for some days; and sent some troops under the command of Maqbūl Khān in Rabī'ul-āwwal in the year 871 A.H., to plunder and <sup>2</sup> ravage the town of Elichpūr. When they plundered the city after occupying the surrounding country, the governor of the place after a part of the night had passed, collected his neighbours such as Qādī Khān and Pīr Khān, and with fifteen hundred horsemen and innumerable foot soldiers came out to fight. When Maqbūl Khān got this news, he despatched the booty and other goods and his equipments with one body of troops and he selected and kept the most useful men with him, and appointed <sup>3</sup> some detachments

<sup>1</sup> Col. Briggs says in a note in vol. IV, page 229, of his History, "I am not aware of any town in Berar bearing this name; and the Teloogoo termination, *conda*, renders it likely to be an error of transcribers. It may be in Mulkapoor which lies in the direct route of the King's retreat."

<sup>2</sup> One MS. substitutes ساخته for بتاخت.

<sup>3</sup> The reading in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. appear to be incorrect. The MSS. have برای چنداول, and برای چندوالی; while the lith. ed. has برای چندولی. The reading in Firishtah is جمعی چند برای جنگ. This appears to be the correct reading, and I have adopted it. As to the incidents connected with Elichpūr, Firishtah agrees generally, with the exception pointed out in the preceding note. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, page 229) quotes an account of the incidents from what he calls "the best authenticated history I have seen", without, however, giving its name. It agrees generally with the Ṭabaqāt and Firishtah. In this account, however, it is stated distinctly what is perhaps implied in the other accounts, viz., "The enemy, as he anticipated, attacked the army for the sake of plundering the camp-equipage, etc.; and at the very

for engaging in a battle; and himself remained in ambush. When the two parties engaged each other Maqbūl Khān came out of ambush, and Ghāzī Khān fled towards Elichpūr. Maqbūl Khān pursued him to the gate of the city. On the way twenty of the notable leaders were slain and thirty were taken prisoners. Maqbūl Khān returned from that place victorious and triumphant to Maḥmūdābād (*i.e.*, Kehrā).

In Jamādī-ul-āwwal 871 A.H., January 1467 A.D., the ruler of the Deccan sent a man of the name of <sup>1</sup> Qāḍī Shaikhān to the capital city of Shādiābād for effecting a treaty of peace; and after much interchange of views peace was concluded on these <sup>2</sup> terms: that the ruler of the Deccan should leave the country of Berār as far as Elichpūr in the possession of Sultān Maḥmūd; and the latter should not henceforward cause any damage to the country of the Deccan. A treaty of peace was written containing these terms and received the agreement of the *amīrs* and great men and divines of the kingdom. In the month of Jamādī-ul-ākhir in the aforementioned year, a robe of honour and the usual remuneration was bestowed on the ambassador Shaikhān; and <sup>3</sup> Mashīr-ul-mulk was sent with him so that the treaty and the agreement might be confirmed in the presence of each other.

---

moment they expected to be crowned with victory, Mukbool Khan charging with his cavalry on the rear of the assailants gave them a total defeat."

<sup>1</sup> The name is قاضی شیخن in one MS. and in the lith. ed., and قاضی سیخن in the other MS. It is not mentioned by Firishtah, who says the rulers of the Deccan and Mālwa sent their emissaries to meet together and does not mention the names of those emissaries.

<sup>2</sup> The terms are slightly different according to Firishtah lith. ed., which says that the ruler of the Deccan should leave Sultān Maḥmūd in possession as far as Elichpūr and of the country of Gōndwāra and Baqālī, as far as Kehrā; and Sultān Maḥmūd should cause no injury to the country of the Deccan. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, page 230) says that "it was agreed, according to some historians, that Kehrā should be retained by Malwa, and that it should be considered as the southern limit of the kingdom; while others have asserted, that Elichpoor was ceded to Malwa on condition of the King refraining from invading the Deccan in future." The Cambridge History of India, page 359, says that Maḥmūd's possession of Kehrā was confirmed, but the integrity of Berār, with that exception, was maintained.

<sup>3</sup> The name is Mashīr-ul-mulk and Shēr-ul-mulk in the MSS. and Sharf-ul-mulk in the lith. ed. It is not mentioned anywhere else. M. Hidayat Ḥosain has شیر البک in the text-edition.

After some days Sultān Maḥmūd ordered that the accounts of the offices should be kept according to lunar dates, and these dates should be written instead of the solar dates; and from the year 871 A.H. the lunar dates were entered in the accounts of all offices.

In the month of Rabī'ul-āwwal of the aforementioned year, <sup>1</sup> Shaikh Nūr-ud-dīn, who was one of the most learned men of the age arrived in the neighbourhood of Mandū. Sultān Maḥmūd went as far as the *Hauḍ-i-rānī*, the rānī's tank or reservoir, to meet him; and they embraced each other at the heads of their horses, and the Sultān showed him great honour and respect.

In Dhī-ḥijjah of the aforesaid year Maulānā 'Imūd, an emissary of Saiyid Muḥammad Nūr Baksh came and waited on Sultān Maḥmūd. He brought the patched garb of the Shaikh as a gift of good omen. The Sultān considered the arrival of the garb a sign of good fortune, and welcomed the arrival of Maulānā 'Imūd-ud-dīn with gratitude; and owing to his great pleasure and happiness kissed the <sup>2</sup> garb, and opening his hand of liberality and lavishness, made all the learned men and Shaikhs and honoured men of the country, who were present in the assembly, delighted and fortunate.

In the month of Muḥarram 872 A.H., August 1467, <sup>3</sup> swift messengers, who could race with the wind, brought to the notice of

<sup>1</sup> The name is Shaikh Nūr-ud-dīn in the MSS., and also in the lith. ed., and the place of his arrival is مندو Mandū, in one MS. and مندور in the other; while it is مندوسور Mandisor in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. calls the man Shaikh 'Alā-ud-dīn and the place of his arrival, the neighbourhood of Shādīābād Mandū.

<sup>2</sup> One MS. has خلعتی instead of تلقی and خرقه را پوشیده instead of خرقه را بوسیده by mistake. M. Hidayat Ḥosain has, however, retained خرقه را پوشیده in the text-edition.

<sup>3</sup> Firishtah and Col. Briggs agree generally, but the Cambridge History of India, page 359, says that Muhammad III of the Deccan tampered with the loyalty of Maqbūl Khān, and the latter surrendered the fortress to the son of the Raja when Maḥmūd had imprisoned; and it also calls Tāj Khān and Ahmad Khān Maḥmūd's sons. I cannot find any authority for these statements. In the genealogy of the kings of Mālwa, on page 713 of the History, Ghiyās-ud-dīn is shown as the only son of Sultān Maḥmūd I, though we know that there was at least one other son, Qadam Khān or Fidāi Khān, also known as Sultān 'Alā-ud-dīn. It may be that the name of the only son of Sultān Maḥmūd,

the Sultān, that Maqbūl Khān, of perverted destiny, had ravaged the town of Maḥmūdābād, which is now celebrated as Kehrā, and had applied to the ruler of the Deccan for protection; and had also made over some elephants, which had for administrative purposes been kept with him to the Rāyzāda of Kehrā; and the latter had taken possession of the town; and had put all Musalmāns, who had been residing in the fort, to death. He had also made a tribe of Gōnds join him, and had by their help closed up all roads. Immediately on hearing this news, Sultān sent Tāj Khān and Aḥmad Khān to put down this rebellion; and he himself also encamped at N'alcha on the 20th Rabi'-ul-ākḥīr of the aforementioned year; and after a few days he started towards Maḥmūdābād. News reached him on the way that Tāj Khān and Aḥmad Khān had reached that place on the <sup>1</sup> *Dussehrāh* day, which is a great day of the Brahmans, after making a forced march of seventy *karōhs*. When they were informed that the Rāyzāda was at his meal, Tāj Khān said, "It is not the act of a brave man to attack an enemy, when he is unaware of his danger." He therefore stopped his horse there, and sent a man to the Rāyzāda and gave him notice. The latter withdrew his hand from his food, and took up his arms and with his men came out to give battle. Such great exertions were made by the two parties, that nothing greater can be imagined. In the end most of the Rāyzāda's men became food for the sword; and he himself fled with head and feet bare; and sought the protection of the Gōnds. The elephants which had been with Maqbūl Khān and other booty and the town of Maḥmūdābād again came into Sultān Maḥmūd's possession. When the report of Tāj Khān reached Sultān Maḥmūd he was extremely delighted. He appointed Malik-ul-unarā Malik Dāūd to chastise the tribe who had given shelter to the Rāyzāda. When this news reached them, they sent the Rāyzāda under confinement to Tāj Khān.

After the victory Sultān Maḥmūd marched towards Maḥmūdābād; and encamped on the 6th of Rajab-ul-murajjab, in the town of Sūrāngpūr. At that place, after a few days Khwājah Jamāl-ud-dīn

---

who became a ruler of Mālwa is given in the genealogy; but the names of five sons of Hūshang Shāh, none of whom ascended the throne, are given.

<sup>1</sup> One MS. has, by mistake, روز سهرا .

Astrābādī came as an ambassador from the honoured <sup>1</sup> Mirzā Abū Sa'īd with fine presents and gifts. Sultān Maḥmūd was very pleased and delighted on his arrival, and made him happy with royal favours, and gave him permission to return. He also sent various <sup>2</sup> presents of the articles of Hindūstān, such as different kinds of silk and linen fabrics, and some <sup>3</sup> slave girls skilled in dancing and singing, and some elephants and some eunuchs and a few *Shāriks* and talking *Tūfīs* (parrots) and some 'Arab horses in charge of Shaikhzāda 'Alā-ud-din in company with Khwājah Jamāl-ud-din. The Sultān then remained (for some time) in Shādīābād.

In the year 873 A.H., 1468 A.D., a petition came from Ghāzī Khān, to the effect that the *zamīndārs* of Kachwārah had placed their feet outside the high road of allegiance. Immediately on its arrival, Sultān Maḥmūd taking the difficulties of the entrances and exits from the country into his consideration, planned the erection of a fortress in the centre of the country, which was completed in the course of six days. It received the name of Jalālpūr and <sup>4</sup> Mirzā Khān was placed in charge of it.

On the 8th Sha'bān of the aforementioned year <sup>5</sup> Shaikh

<sup>1</sup> Ruler of Transoxiana, third in descent from Timūr, and grandfather of Bābar.

<sup>2</sup> One MS. inserts سوختات تحفای after سوختات .

<sup>3</sup> One MS. has چند کنیزکی رقاص و گویندہ , the other has چند کنیز خاص . چند کنیز while the lith. ed. has چند نیز و گویندہ . The first is the correct reading and I have adopted it. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, page 232) says that "dancing women, and singers mounted on elephants superbly caparisoned, together with a number of Indian and Abyssinian slaves for the seraglio." He calls the *shāriks*, *mcinas*, but this is not correct. The dictionary describes *shāriks* as a species of talking bird, a grackle, a nightingale. In Bengali *sūks* and *sūrīs* are said to be two kinds of talking birds, the former being supposed to be the male and the latter the female; and as far as I know the *shārik* is a variant of *sūrī*; the *tūfī* being the *sūk* or parrot. The Cambridge History of India does not mention the presents, but otherwise generally agrees with the text.

<sup>4</sup> The name is منیر خان in one MS., and in the lith. ed. It is میرزا خان in the other MS. and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah; and Meer Khan in Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 233). The name is not mentioned in the Cambridge History of India. M. Hidayat Hosain has منیر خان in the text-edition.

<sup>5</sup> The name is Shaikh Muhammad Farnālī in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah; but the lith. ed. of the Ṭabaqūt and the Cambridge History of India have Shaikhzāda Muhammad Qarnālī (p. 360).



Muḥammad Farmalī and Kapūr Chand, son of the Rāja of Gwāliar came as ambassadors of Sultān Bahlūl Lūdī, the *Bādshāh* of Dehlī, and waited upon the Sultān Maḥmūd, in the neighbourhood of Fathābād; and offered the presents which they had brought. They also submitted the following by word of mouth; "Sultān Ḥusain Sharqī does not keep his hand from me. If his Majesty the Sultān comes to the neighbourhood of Dehlī to help and reinforce me, and removes from me the disturbance created by him, I shall make over the fortress of Biyāna with its dependencies as tribute at the time of his return; and whenever the Sultān would advance in this direction I shall send six thousand horsemen, with necessary equipments, to wait on, and accompany him." Sultān Maḥmūd said, "Whenever Sultān Ḥusain should advance towards Dehlī, I shall with great rapidity betake myself to you and support you." Upon this agreement he conferred great favours on the ambassadors, and bestowed on them valuable robes of honour, and bade them farewell.

On the following day he started from that place, and advanced towards his capital of Shādīābād. As the air was extremely hot on the road, his health fell out of <sup>1</sup> equability and his illness became greater day by day, till on the 19th Dhī-q'adah in the year 873 A.H., <sup>2</sup> May 26th 1569, he passed away in the country of Kachwārah from the waste country of the world to the happy land of the after life. The period of his reign was thirty-four years.

Couplet:

Although with grandeur to the sky he lifts the throne,  
To the <sup>3</sup> grandeur of the burial, at last, he carries his all.

<sup>1</sup> The readings in the MSS. are از حد اعتدال and از اعتدال and in the lith. ed. با اعتدال. I have adopted the first reading, while in the text-edition it is از حد اعتدال.

<sup>2</sup> The Cambridge History of India (p. 360) gives June 1st 1469 as the date of the death. Firishtah agrees with the Ṭabaqāt in saying that the Sultān died in the country of Kachwārah; but the Cambridge History of India, page 360, says he expired shortly after his arrival at Mandū, or as it always wrongly calls it Māndū.

<sup>3</sup> The MSS. and the lith. ed. of Firishtah have بچاه لحد, but the lith. ed. of the Ṭabaqāt has بچاه لحد, which would of course mean to the well or pit of the burial; this last has been adopted in the text-edition.

The similarity between the age of Sultān Maḥmūd at the time of his accession with the period of his reign is not without a certain singularity and curiosity. His Majesty the Lord of the Conjunction, Amīr Timūr Gūrgān also ascended the throne of the empire as a matter of permanence in his 36th year, and the period of his reign was also 36 years; and after his death 36 of his sons and grandsons were <sup>1</sup> living and in their places.

<sup>2</sup> AN ACCOUNT OF SULTĀN GHĪYĀTH-UD-DĪN, SON OF SULTĀN MAḤMŪD KHALJĪ.

When Sultān Maḥmūd Khaljī passed away, his eldest son Sultān Ghīyāth-ud-dīn sat on the throne of the empire; and putting out the hand of liberality and lavishness from the sleeve of generosity and beneficence, made all the sections of the people satisfied and grateful. He distributed the gold, which had been scattered over his umbrella, among men of culture and other deserving people. <sup>3</sup> He confirmed the territory of Ranthambhōr which have been already allotted to him, to his younger brother, who bore the title of Sultān 'Alā-ud-dīn and was known as Qadam Khān. He, in order to please him, also bestowed on him certain other *parganas*, which had been in his

<sup>1</sup> There are slight differences in the readings. One MS. has *حی قائم بودند* another has *و قائم بوده اند* ; while the lith. ed. has *و قائم بوده اند* . Firishtah lith. ed. has no corresponding passage. The second reading has been adopted in the text-edition.

<sup>2</sup> There are differences in the heading also. One MS. has what I have got in the text, the other has *ذکر سلطان غیاث الدین خلجی* , while the lith. ed. has only *ذکر سلطان غیاث الدین* .

<sup>3</sup> Firishtah has, he made *فدیخان* , Fidi Khān, his brother, happy by conferring on him *شهر نو* *Shahr-i-Nau*, and certain other *parganas*, which he had in his possession in the time of Sultān Maḥmūd Khaljī; Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 236) calls the brother Fidwy Khan, but agrees with the *Ṭabaqāt* in saying that Ranthumbhore was conferred on him, to be held in perpetuity. The Cambridge History of India, page 361, says that "his next brother Tāj Khān was confirmed in his fiefs, and received the title of 'Alā-ud-dīn, and his younger brother Fidāi Khān was permitted to retain Ranthambhor and other districts." Neither the *Ṭabaqāt* nor Firishtah mention Tāj Khān as a son of Sultān Maḥmūd Khaljī; and they say that Qadam Khān or Fidi Khān had the title of Sultān 'Alā-ud-dīn. *فدن خان* in the text-edition.

possession in the time of Sultān Maḥmūd. He made Shāhzāda 'Abd-ul-qādir his heir, after conferring on him the title of <sup>1</sup> Nāṣir Shāh; and entrusted the duties of the *vazārat* to him. He conferred on him the umbrella and palanquin and polished still-ball as ensigns of royalty; and a *jāgīr* of twelve thousand horsemen. He also gave orders to the *Khāns* and *amīrs*, that they should go every morning to salute him, and come to the palace in attendance at his stirrups. When he had finished the festivities and rites of the accession, he sent for the *amīrs* one day, and said, "As I have spent 34 years at the stirrups of my father in labours and expedition, it now comes to my mind, that I should endeavour to guard what has come to me from my father, and should not give myself the trouble to acquire more; and should open the <sup>2</sup> door of peace and rest, and pleasure and enjoyment on me, and those depending on me. It is better to keep the territories in <sup>3</sup> peace and quiet, than to strike one's hand on those of others." He commenced to endeavour to collect musicians; and they came to his threshold from all directions. He filled his seraglio with <sup>4</sup> beautiful slave girls and daughters of Rājās and *zamīndārs*; and in this matter made very great exertions. He taught an art and a profession to each of the beautiful girls; and taking their fitness into consideration, taught some the arts of dancing and singing; and others those of reading and recitation and playing on the flute; and a small number the art of wrestling. He had five hundred Abyssinian slave

<sup>1</sup> Firishtah and Col. Briggs say that the title of Sooltan Nasir-ood-Deen was conferred by Gheias-ood-deen on his eldest son, and he was made heir-apparent and *vazīr*. The Cambridge History of India, page 362, says that Sultān Ghiyās-ud-dīn "associated him with himself in the business of government." It appears, however, more correct to say that the Sultān left the government entirely in his hands.

<sup>2</sup> One MS. has *در امن و آسایش و عشرت*. The other has *امانش*, incorrectly, for *اسایش*. The lith. ed. has *عیش و عشرت* before *عیش و*. This appears to me to be better than either of the two other readings, and has been adopted as correct.

<sup>3</sup> One MS. has *در دامن و امان داشتن* and both MSS. have *په* instead of *بہتر* and *دست زند* instead of *دست زند*; in the text-edition M. Hidayat Ḥosain has adopted the first reading.

<sup>4</sup> One MS. and the lith. ed. have *کنیزان صاحب جمال*, while the other MS. has *کنیز قا صاحب جمال*.

girls dressed in male attire, and arming them with swords and shields gave them the name of the *Habirash* band. He also called five hundred Turki slave girls in the Turki dress as the Mughul band. He also trained five hundred slave girls, who were distinguished for the strength of their genius and the keenness of their intelligence, in various kinds of learning; and he had one of them join him every day at his meals. He selected a number of them, and entrusted various affairs of state, such as the office of demands, and the watching of receipts and expenditure of the country, and the supervision of various factories, to them.

<sup>1</sup> He also established a market in his harem, so that whatever went to the market of the city for sale was also sold there. Altogether sixteen thousand slave girls were collected in his harem; and <sup>2</sup> each one of them had every day two silver *tankas* and two *mans* of grain; and in equalising this allowance he acted with the greatest meticulousness, so that Rāni Khurshid who was the highest of the members of the seraglio and had great love for him, and great authority in all affairs, also had two *mans* of grain by lawful weight and two *tankas*. He had also ordered a servant that he should place every day cooked food at the mouths of the holes of mice and rats. He had also ordered his officers, that when he offered thanks for the gifts of the great and holy God, and when the benefits, which the great God had showered on him, came before eyes, they should give fifty *tankas* by way of thanks-offering to deserving men; and <sup>3</sup> should not suspend it during

<sup>1</sup> The Cambridge History of India, page 362, says, "A replica in miniature of the great bazar in the city was erected within the precincts of the palace, and was filled with the artists, artisans and craftswomen of the harem." This does not convey the meaning of the statement in the text.

<sup>2</sup> Firishtah agrees, but he adds *غیر سرداران و منصبداران*, i.e., except *sardars* (chiefs), and *manas dārs*; but this does not agree with Ṭabaqāt according to which even Rāni Khurshid had the usual allowance. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 236) gives each of them "two seers of grain and two tankas of copper." The Cambridge History of India does not give the exact amount paid to each woman, but adds (p. 362), that "the king himself regulated with meticulous nicety the pay and allowance of all, even to the quantities of grain, fodder, and meat allotted to the various animals employed or domesticated" in the harem.

<sup>3</sup> The reading is doubtful and the meaning is obscure. The readings in MSS. are *و بدوات معطل ندارند* and *و بدوات معطل ندارند* which are clearly incorrect.

sleep. <sup>1</sup> He also ordered that to each person young or old to whom he might speak anything outside, they should give one thousand *tankas* in the shape of a reward. Most of his time was passed in pleasure and enjoyment. After a watch of the night had passed, he girded the belt of service, in the middle of his life, and occupied himself with the ceremonies of worship; and rubbed his forehead in the dust of humility and poverty; and entering by the door of humility begged for the grant of his object and desires from the great and holy God.

He had given an order to one who was near him, that he should bring to his notice at a fitting place, whatever might take place in his kingdom, and any petition that might come from any frontiers (of his kingdom). If in any affair of the country, there was doubt among the *vazīrs* they used to write a statement of the facts and send it to the palace, and he wrote a fitting reply and sent it to them. It is stated that Sultān Bahlūl Lūdi the *Bādshāh* of Dehli raided the <sup>2</sup> town of Alhanpūr, which appertained to the Sultāns of Mālwa; and great injury was done to the residents of the town. No one could place his foot of daring forward and bring this matter to the notice of Sultān Ghiyāth-ud-dīn. In the end by the advice and counsel of the *vazīrs*, Ḥasan took advantage of an opportunity one day, and reported that Sultān Bahlūl used to send every year the whole of the profits, in the form of tribute and *salāmī* (bonus) to the fortunate Sultān Maḥmūd Shāh; and it was now being heard that he had committed an act of audacity, and his troops had stretched the arm of plunder and rapine to the town of <sup>3</sup> Alhanpūr. On hearing this news, he immediately sent an order to Shēr Khān, son of Muẓaffar Khān,

---

The lith. ed. has *و بخواب معطل ندارند*; this seems to be the correct reading, and has been adopted. M. Hidayat Ḥosain, however, has retained the first reading.

<sup>1</sup> The meaning of the payment of this large reward is not clear. It is not clear also what is meant by *در بیرون*. Does it mean outside the harem?

<sup>2</sup> Both MSS. have *قصبه الہندپور*, but the lith. ed. has *قصبہ رستپور*. Firishtah lith. ed. has in the corresponding passage *پالنپور*. Col. Briggs has Runthunbhore, and the Cambridge History of India, page 361, has Pālampur near Ranthambhor. The fact that Sultān Ghiyās-ud-dīn did not attack Bahlūl Lodi when the latter invaded Mālwa, but ordered Sher Khān to do so is given in the Cambridge History of India, as an illustration of his being averse to war. I think it was due to his laziness and inertia.

<sup>3</sup> Here also the MSS. have *الہندپور*.

the ruler of Chandēri, that he should take the armies of Bhīlsa and Sānrangpūr with him, and proceed to chastise Sultān Bahlūl. After receiving the order, Shēr Khān collected his troops, and advanced towards Biyāna. As Sultān Bahlūl saw that he did not possess the strength to meet Shēr Khān, he abandoned Biyāna, and went to Dehli. Shēr Khān pursued him, and advanced towards Dehli. Sultān Bahlūl then, by offering terms of peace and making presents, turned him back and the latter then rebuilt <sup>1</sup> Alhanpūr and then came back to Chandēri. They narrate that every night he placed some gold *mōhurs* under his pillow, and every morning he gave them away to deserving people. <sup>2</sup> He had ordered seventy slave girls, who had memorised the holy *Qurān*, that at the time when he changed his clothes they would finish the *Qurān* and <sup>3</sup> blow their breath on the garment. In <sup>4</sup> respect of the beauty of his belief and simplicity, they narrate that one day a man brought to him a hoof of an ass, and said, "This is a hoof of the ass of Jesus." He ordered that they should bestow on the man fifty thousand *tankas*, and he bought the hoof. To make the story short, three other men, who brought three other hoofs also sold each of them for a similar sum. It so happened that another man also brought one in, and the Sultān gave orders for giving fifty thousand *tankas* to him. One of the attendants of His Majesty said, "Perhaps the ass of Jesus had five legs, so that such a sum is being paid for the fifth hoof." The Sultān said that perhaps this man is telling the truth, while one of the others may have brought a wrong

---

<sup>1</sup> See notes 2 and 3 on page 546. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 238) calls the place Lallpore. The year of Bahlūl Lūdī's invasion is not given in the *Ṭabaqāt*. Firishtah says it was in 889 A.H., while Col. Briggs has 887 A.H., and 1482 A.D., as the year (vol. IV, p. 237).

<sup>2</sup> This is mentioned by Firishtah also, but he says that there were one thousand and not seventy slave girls who had memorised the *Qurān* and they recited it together when he changed his clothes.

<sup>3</sup> This means that each of the slave girls used to blow on the garment after reciting three-sevenths of each *pārah* of the *Qurān* (the *Qurān* being divided into thirty *pārahs* or parts) in order to render the garments of the king pure, blessed or holy.

<sup>4</sup> This story is mentioned in the Cambridge History of India, see page 363, but while the Muslim historian mentions it as an illustration of the Sultān's حسن اعتقاد و سادگی لوحی, the English historian calls him the "crowned fool".

hoof. He had also ordered those who were near him, that when he was engaged in pleasure, or was occupied in talking with worldly people, they should bring a piece of cloth before him to which he gave the name of a shroud; and he, taking alarm, would perform his ablutions anew, and having prayed for pardon again occupy himself in worship. He had also told the members of his harem with great emphasis, that they should wake him up for the night prayer; and (if necessary) dash water on his face. If it so happened that his sleep was heavy, they pulled him out by force and wakened him. And if he was engaged in any festive function, and did not rise on receiving one or two intimations, they, according to his orders, caught his hands, and lifted him up. People never said a word in his *majlis*, which was contrary to the law of the Prophet or which would cause pain. And he never saw (partook of) any intoxicating drinks. One day they had made an electuary for him, and had spent a *lakh* of *tankas* on it. He ordered that they should tell him the name of the ingredients, and it then appeared that there were three hundred and odd drugs in one *diram* of nutmeg. The Sultān said, "This electuary cannot be used by me," and ordered that it should be converted into a morsel of fire. Someone said, "Let it be bestowed on someone else." He said, "Alas! that I should prescribe for another, what I do not consider right for myself."

<sup>2</sup> At one time one of the neighbours of Shaikh Maḥmūd Na'mān, who was one of the companions of the Sultān, came to him from Dehlī; and said, "I have come remembering the promises and gifts of the Sultān, so that by your intervention, I may get from him the wherewithal for the marriage of my daughter." The Shaikh said, "I am prepared to pay myself the amount you require." He replied "I will not take it from you, I wish that I may partake of the gifts of the Sultān, and my respectability may thereby be increased. The

---

<sup>1</sup> The matter of the electuary is mentioned by Firishtah and his account agrees with that in the text.

<sup>2</sup> This is preceded in the lith. ed. by the words *حكايت غريب*, a strange story; but these words are not found in either MS. The Cambridge History of India, page 363, gives this story also, but omits most of the particulars. The man is described as a beggar from Dehli, but the reason of his journey is not mentioned, nor is Shaikh Maḥmūd Na'mān, who engineered the fraud.

Shaikh insisted, but the other did not agree. At last the Shaikh said, "I recommend those who come to me on the ground of the greatness of their ancestors, or on their own excellences. You do not possess either of these qualifications. With what qualities shall I praise you?" The man replied, "I have brought myself to you, you act according to your own intelligence and wisdom." The Shaikh took the man with him to the audience hall of the Sultān; and he told him to take a handful of the wheat which the men were weighing there for the *faqīrs*. When the Shaikh met the Sultān, that man was also behind him. The Sultān said, "Who is this man?" He replied, "This man has memorised the holy *Qurān*. He has brought a handful of wheat as a present, on each gram of which he has finished the *Qurān*." The Sultān said, "Why did you bring him here? I should have gone to him." The Shaikh said, "He does not possess such a position or qualifications, that the Sultān should go to him." The Sultān said, "If he is not fit for it, his present is priceless." As the Sultān insisted, the Shaikh settled that the man should bring his presents to the *Jāma* Mosque on the following Friday. When they had finished their prayers, the Sultān ordered that the man should mount the pulpit, and throw the grains of wheat in the lap of the Sultān's skirt, and the Sultān favoured him with a variety of gifts.

<sup>1</sup> They have narrated, that one day the Sultān said to his intimates, "I have collected some thousands of beautiful women in my harem; but I have not yet found a person such as my heart desires." Of the men who were present one said, "Perhaps the men who were employed in this service were not perfect in discerning a beautiful person. If this slave is employed in this work, it is likely that he should find a person, that may be agreeable to the Sultān." The Sultān said, "What do you consider a beautiful person?" He said, "It is one, each part of whose person, which comes to the beholder's sight, deprives the latter of the desire to see any other part; for instance if he sees her figure, he becomes so fascinated with her, that he has no desire to see her face." The Sultān was pleased with

---

<sup>1</sup> This is also preceded by the word *حكايت*, story, in the lith. ed., but the word is omitted in both MSS. This story is also narrated by Firishtah; but it does not appear to be mentioned by Col. Briggs or in the Cambridge History of India.



this judgment of his about a woman's beauty. The man then took leave of the Sultān and went round the country. But although he cast his eyes over all the world, he did not find what he wanted. However he arrived at a place, where he saw a young woman, who went walking gracefully. Her gait and figure enchanted him. When taking great care he cast his eyes on her beautiful face, he found something much better than what he wanted. He remained there for some days and, by such trickery as he knew, took her along; and placing her in the service of the Sultān made him happy. He told the Sultān that he had bought her for so many thousands *dirams*.

After some days, the father and mother of the young woman became acquainted with this matter; and knew that a man, who had stayed in the village for some time, had taken away their daughter. Having sought a clue to his name and country, they came to the Sultān praying for justice. They happened to meet him at the crossing of two roads and begged for justice. The Sultān knew that they were complaining about that particular young lady. He did not take a single stop from the place where he was; and ordered that men learned in the law should be directed to attend there. Then he asked them to pass on him the sentence directed by the law of the Prophet. The complainants, on becoming acquainted with the truth of the matter, submitted that their complaint was for this reason that that man had taken away their daughter. As she had now become an inmate of the harem of Sultān, it was a matter of honour and happiness to them, more specially as she had become a Musalmān, and had left their faith; and they were now pleased and satisfied.

Then the Sultān told the learned men, the woman has now become my lawful wife; but for the time that has passed, you should carry out in respect of me whatever might be the order of the law. If I deserve to be put to death, I shall hold you absolved for causing my death. The learned men said that whatever is done without knowledge is pardoned in the law; and is absolved by penitence. In spite of this decision, the Sultān was repentant about this: and forbade his servants to seek for and produce any women.

<sup>1</sup> In the year 887 A.H., 1482 A.D., there was a conjunction of

---

<sup>1</sup> These conjunctions are mentioned by Firishtah also. He, however, says distinctly that he took the account from the Ṭabaqāt, and also says that

planets; that is Saturn and Jupiter became contiguous and near to each other in degree and minute in the sign of Syrpio, and the <sup>1</sup> five stars were also collected in one sign of the Zodiac. The evil caused by these conjunctions appeared in most countries; and specially in Khalji territories there was much <sup>2</sup> disturbance, as will clearly be seen from the account of Nāsir Shāh.

In the year 889 A.H., 1484 A.D., an ambassador came from the Rāj of Chāmpānīr, and submitted a petition to the following effect: "When in former times <sup>3</sup> Sultān Maḥmūd, son of Sultān Aḥmad besieged Chāmpānīr, Sultān Maḥmūd Shāh came to help and assist the slaves; and <sup>4</sup> released us from the siege; and now Sultān Maḥmūd Gujratī has come and is again besieging Chāmpānīr. If your Majesty considering our ancient relations of servitorship to you, would advance to release us, it would be the cause of an increase of your protection and bravery. A sum of one *lakh* of *tinkas* would be remitted to your officers as a contribution towards your expenses." When the report reached Sultān he collected his troops, and came and took up his residence in the palace of Na'leha. The next day he sent for the learned men and the *Qādis* to his *majlis* and asked them for a ruling on this point. "A Musalmān *Bālschāh* has besieged a hill of a *Kāfir*. Is it allowed to me according to the law of the Prophet that I should

---

the coming of Bahālū Lūdhī and the destruction of Alhanpūr or Pāhanpūr was among the effects of these conjunctions. They do not appear to be mentioned either by Col. Briggs or in the Cambridge History of India.

<sup>1</sup> The five stars are *عطارد* Mercury, *زهره* Venus, *مشتری* Jupiter, *مریخ* Mars, *زحل* Saturn.

<sup>2</sup> The MSS. have *اختلاجی* and the lith. ed. has *اختلانی*; while Firishtah in the corresponding passage has *اختلالی*. This last seems to be the most appropriate word, and I have adopted it.

<sup>3</sup> So in both MSS., and in the lith. ed. As a matter of fact the correct name of the son of Sultān Aḥmad was Sultān Muḥammad. Probably Sultān Maḥmūd, who ascended the throne in 862 A.H., and was contemporaneous with Sultān Maḥmūd Khalji, who reigned from 839 A.H. to 873 A.H., is meant, but he was the son of Sultān Muḥammad and grand-son of Sultān Aḥmad. Firishtah lith. ed. mentions the fact of Sultān Ghiyāth-ud-dīn's march to Na'leha, but he does not mention the particulars of the previous siege. Neither Col. Briggs nor the Cambridge History of India mentions the matter.

<sup>4</sup> One MS. has, by mistake, *خلمی بودند* instead of *خلمی بود*.

advance to aid the *Kāfirs*?" All the learned men said, "It is not allowed." Sultān *Ghiyāth*-ud-dīn then bade farewell to the ambassador from Chāmpānīr; and went back to his own capital.

When old age overtook the Sultān, disputes commenced about the possession of the kingdom between Sultān Nāṣir-ud-dīn and <sup>1</sup> Shujā'at *Khān*, who had the title of Sultān 'Alā-ud-dīn; and in spite of the fact, that they were twin brothers, things came to such a pass, that they made attempts on the lives of each other. Rānī *Khūrshid*, the daughter of the Rāy of Baglāna who was the chief inmate of the harem of Sultān *Ghiyāth*-ud-dīn, took the side of Shujā'at *Khān*, and wanted to turn Sultān *Ghiyāth*-ud-dīn against Sultān Nāṣir-ud-dīn. This matter will be described in the account of Sultān Nāṣir-ud-dīn. To be brief, Sultān Nāṣir-ud-dīn lost the bridle of power and fled from Mandū; and having taken up a position in the centre of the kingdom, brought over the *amīrs* to his side; and coming back besieged the fort of Mandū. Sultān 'Alā-ud-dīn <sup>2</sup> having given encouragement and comfort to a body of five thousand Gujrātīs made vain efforts. In the end, the *Ghiyāth* Shāhī *amīrs* opened the gates; and invited Nāṣir-ud-dīn into the fort. When Shujā'at *Khān* saw that Sultān Nāṣir-ud-dīn had entered by the gate, he went and took shelter with

---

<sup>1</sup> One MS. has شجاع خان. Firishtah's account of the quarrels between two brothers is somewhat more detailed. He says they began in 903 A.H., 1491 A.D., when Sultān *Ghiyāth*-ud-dīn had become old and decrepit. Rānī *Khūrshid* attempted to have Nāṣir-ud-dīn seized; whereupon in 905 A.H., he fled; and seeing that the Rānī was still bent on his destruction, he took up a position in the centre of the country, and *amīrs* and soldiers came, and joined him; and he assumed the emblems of royalty, and advanced and besieged the fort of Mandū. As he had acted as his father's *vazīr* for years, people knew him. They opened the gates of the fort and brought him into it without the opposite party knowing anything about it. Shujā'at *Khān* or 'Alā-ud-dīn fled to his father's palace, but he and the Rānī were dragged out; and he and his son were butchered like so many sheep. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 239) gives a similar account, but he adds that Nasir-ood-Deen was admitted into the fort by the Tarapoor gate, on the 24th of Rubbee-oos-Sany, A.H. 906, October 22nd, 1500 A.D.; and also that Alla-ood-Deen and all his children and all his family were put to death. The account in the Cambridge History of India, page 363, is somewhat different in some particulars.

<sup>2</sup> One MS. has پنجهزار گجراتی را بخود موافق ساخته and دلاسا کرد; this is followed in the text-edition.

his father; and after some days, when the foundations of the palace of the Nāsir Shāhi rule became stronger, Shujā'at Khān and his sons were summoned to the Sultān's presence and were beheaded. On the 9th of Ramaḍān in the year 906 A.H., Sultān Ghiyāth-ud-dīn was attacked by the disease of dysentery, and joined the vicinity of God. <sup>1</sup> Some say that Sultān Nāsir-ud-dīn killed his father by giving him poison. Sultān Nāsir-ud-dīn sent a message to Rāni Khūrshid that she should make over to the treasurer all the treasures of the Sultān which were in her possession, otherwise she would suffer much trouble. The Rāni having regard to his probable harsh treatment, brought over all the treasures and property which were hidden and concealed in the harem; and made them over to the Nāsir Shāhi agents.

The period of his (*i.e.*, Sultān Ghiyāth-ud-dīn's) reign was <sup>2</sup> thirty-two years and seventeen days.

#### AN ACCOUNT OF SULTĀN NĀSIR-UD-DĪN.

Historians are agreed that the birth of Sultān Nāsir-ud-dīn took place during the reign of Sultān Maḥmūd Khalji. Maḥmūd Shāh and Ghiyāth Shāh in their great joy arranged festive entertainments; and for one month kept the bed of pleasure and enjoyment spread out. In thanks-giving for this great gift, the ordinary *ra'iyats* generally, and men of wisdom and deserving men specially, were made participators in the board of their benefactions and the tables of their favours. Astrologers, who knew the stars, reported that the Shāhzāda was born with a happy fortune, and in an auspicious moment; and would get perfect nurture and full education from the nurse of the age; and will be supreme and unrivalled in all the various arts, and the different cultures and education. On the 7th day after the birth, he was produced before the great and holy men, and received the name of 'Abd-ul-qādir. Both in the time of his youth and in that of his manhood, the marks of royalty and empire were patent

<sup>1</sup> Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 240) thinks that the accusation is false, as Nasir-ood-Deen had "been already crowned by his father's consent", but the fact, that many of the important nobles rebelled against Nāsir-ud-dīn, would lead one to infer that the accusation had some foundation.

<sup>2</sup> Firishtah and Col. Briggs make it thirty-three years.

and clear and bright on his forehead. When he reached the years of discretion, and excelled all his contemporaries in the matter of the duties of leadership and chieftainship, Sulṭān Ghiyāth-ud-dīn made him his heir apparent; and entrusted the duties of the *naṣrat* to him. His younger brother, Shujā'at Khān, although outwardly he did not forget any of the minutiae of agreement, still being hostile to him in spirit, got a number of men to combine with him. One day he represented in private to Sulṭān Ghiyāth-ud-dīn that "A number of audacious, low men have collected in the service of Sulṭān Nāṣir-ud-dīn, and are inciting him to seize the kingdom. It is better to remedy an event before it actually occurs." He made so many insinuations, that the intention of seizing the Shāhrāda and of imprisoning him became impressed on the Sulṭān's mind. But as the marks of nobility and the token of sovereignty were evident in his countenance, his paternal affection induced him to apply the ointment of kindness and favour on the wound of his heart, and make him more powerful. He accordingly ordered that the pay-master of the kingdom should send orders to the *amīrs* and to heads of all bands, that they should go every morning to offer their salutation to Sulṭān Nāṣir-ud-dīn, and should attend at his stirrups to the palace gate.

Sulṭān Nāṣir-ud-dīn now took up all the affairs of state permanently in his own hand; and appointed his own *gumāshṭas* (his agents) everywhere. As he allotted the management of the *Khālisa parganas* (i.e., *parganas* in the direct possession of the sovereign) to Shaikh Ḥabīb and Khwājah Suhail eunuchs, <sup>2</sup> Yakān Khān and Amman and Mūnjā Baqāl, who had before this been the officers in charge of the *Khālisa* complained to Rānī Khūrshīd, who was of a mannish disposition. The latter as she was inclined towards Shujā'at Khān, and her mind was not free from evil towards Sulṭān Nāṣir-ud-dīn, reported (to the Sulṭān) through Shujā'at Khān that Malik Maḥmūd *Kōturāl* and

<sup>1</sup> One MS. has the text I have adopted, while the other omits the word Sulṭān Ghiyāth-ud-dīn, and the lith. ed. has روزی در خلوت غیث تدا بعرض رسانید.

<sup>2</sup> The names in the MSS. are as I have given them here. The lith. ed. omits Amman. Firishah lith. ed. has موتی خان, and ممکن خان. The names are not in any other history that I have seen.

<sup>1</sup> Sēv Dās Baqāl, who were the heads and chiefs of the rebels and traitors, have become specially attached to Sultān Nāṣir-ud-dīn, and have made the lease of certain *mauḍas* appertaining to his *jāgīr* the pretext of their visits to him. Sultān Ghīyāth-ud-dīn summoned Malik Maḥmūd and Sēv Dās, and, without asking them any questions and making any enquiries, killed them; and ravaged and destroyed the people in their houses.

<sup>2</sup> After this, Sultān Nāṣir-ud-dīn withdrew his hands from the duties of the <sup>3</sup> *razārat*, and did not for some days attend to salute the Sultān. Rānī Khūrshīd and Shujā'at Khān, having got an opportunity through the exertions and management of Yakān Khān and Mūnjā Baqāl, spoke words full of interested suggestions in the garb of disinterestedness, and, having stretched their misappropriating hands to the treasury, with a composed mind took upon themselves the full management of the affairs of the government. Owing to his great age, Sultān Ghīyāth-ud-dīn agreed to their doing so. But as he had heard from disinterested persons that Rānī Khūrshīd and Shujā'at Khān wanted to calumniate and falsely accuse Sultān Nāṣir-ud-dīn, he waited to see their further proceedings. As Shaikh Ḥabīb-ul-lah and Khwājah Suhail knew that Mūnjā Baqāl was the prime mover in all this mischief and disturbance, they waited for an opportunity, and killed him; and fled and went to the harem of Sultān Nāṣir-ud-dīn. Rānī Khūrshīd narrated this story to Sultān Ghīyāth-ud-dīn with much exaggeration and embroidery; and on hearing of this occurrence, the flame of the wrath of the Sultān blazed up; and he sent a number of men with Yakān Khān that they might seize the murderers and

---

<sup>1</sup> The name is سید داس, Sēv Dās, and سید داس Sawī Dās, and the lith. ed. has سوم داس Sōm Dās.

<sup>2</sup> The account of the intrigues and fighting between Sultān Nāṣir-ud-dīn and his partisans on the one side, and Shujā'at Khān and Rānī Khūrshīd and their adherents on the other, which extends over several pages in the *Ṭabaqāt*, is dismissed in the course of some twenty lines by Col. Briggs on pages 238. 239 of vol. IV of his history, and also in some lines in the *Cambridge History of India*, page 363.

<sup>3</sup> One MS. has وزارت, and the other مهمات after شغل; while the lith. ed. has neither the one nor the other. I have adopted وزارت. In the text-edition, however, it is مهمات.

<sup>1</sup> bring them out from the house of Sultān Nāṣir-ud-dīn. When he gave these men permission to go, he told them that they were on no account to forego any of the minutiae of respect and honour towards Nāṣir Shāh.

At this time Shaikh Ḥabīb-ul-lah and Khwājah Suhail mounted their horses from Sultān Nāṣir-ud-dīn's palace, and rode away to the open country. On the way they went on saying, "We are going to the house of the *Qādī*. Whoever wishes to make any complaint about the murder of Mūnjā Baqāl, let him appear there." Yakān Khān and the other *amīrs* on arriving at the Nāṣir Shāhī *darbār* sent a message. The reply came, "Shaikh Ḥabīb-ul-lah and Khwājah Suhail did not kill Mūnjā Baqāl under my orders, and I do not know where they are gone." Yakān Khān did not accept this reply, and for three days kept the harom of Sultān Nāṣir-ud-dīn under guard. When the Sultān knew that the murderers had fled, and giving further trouble to his son was wrong, he sent Mashīr-ul-mulk <sup>2</sup> and Manhī Khān to him; and sent him a message to say that, "If my son's heart has not been aggrieved and the dust of pain has not clouded the seat of his mind, he should, as in former days, come to me, for I have no more strength to endure the pain of separation and estrangement."

Sultān Nāṣir-ud-dīn, <sup>3</sup> notwithstanding a hundred reasons for caution, obtained the honour of kissing the feet of his benefactor and father; and the father and the son washed off the dust of disturbance from the pages of the ago with their tears. And Sultān Nāṣir-ud-dīn again became zealous in the Sultān's service; and every day saw fresh signs of the Sultān's affection towards him. He planned the building of a palace for his residence in the vicinity of the Ghīyāth Shāhī palace, so that he might always, when he wanted to do so, have the honour of waiting on his father. Rānū Khūrshīd took advantage of an opportunity one day, and said to the Sultān; "Sultān Nāṣir-ud-dīn has erected for himself a house close to the *Jahān-numā* palace; and

<sup>1</sup> One MS. has بیارند, the other has بیاورند, while the lith. ed. has بیورد.

<sup>2</sup> The name is مہنی خان Mahnī Khān, in both MSS. In the lith. ed. it is مستہی خان, Mustahī Khān, while in the lith. ed. of Firishtah it is منتہی خان Muntahī Khān.

<sup>3</sup> Firishtah makes the matter clear by saying با وجود بیم حبس و قید و غیرہ, i.e., in spite of fear of imprisonment, etc.

he apparently intends to act <sup>1</sup> treacherously." Sultān Ghiyāth-ud-dīn without any consideration or deliberation ordered Ghālib Khān, *kōtwāl*, in the year 905 A.H., <sup>2</sup> to destroy completely the Nāṣir Shāhī palace. Sultān Nāṣir-ud-dīn started the same night, with a body of his adherents, in the direction of Dhār, which is situated in the forest of Kishun. Shaikh Hābib-ul-lah and Khwājah Suhail came there, and waited on him. Rānī Khūrshīd and Shujā'at Khān sent an army in pursuit of him, without giving any information to Sultān Ghiyāth-ud-dīn of their having done so. But Sultān Ghiyāth-ud-dīn sent Tātār Khān, so that he might, after conciliating Nāṣir Shāh bring him back to the city. Tātār Khān left his men in the village of <sup>3</sup> Bakankālū; and went in company with Malik Faḍl-ul-lah Bاده, *Mir Shikār*, to Sultān Nāṣir-ud-dīn, and gave him his father's message. The latter wrote a petition which he gave to Tātār Khān, and directed him that he should go and read it to the Sultān, and bring his reply. The well-intentioned Tātār Khān went on wings of speed to Shādīābād, and reported the substance of the petition to Sultān Ghiyāth-ud-dīn. But he had not yet received any reply, when Rānī Khūrshīd, who had very great influence on the mind of the Sultān, sent an order to the pay-master of the empire, that he should appoint Tātār Khān to attack and destroy Nāṣir-ud-dīn. When Tātār Khān became acquainted with these facts, he came down from the fort, and advanced towards <sup>4</sup> Bārah.

The army which had been sent to attack Nāṣir Shāh was on arrival at <sup>5</sup> Bakankālū puzzled and amazed about the result of their acts. (They knew) if they decided to fight, they had reason to be afraid that when the turn of Nāṣir Shāh came, each one of them

<sup>1</sup> One MS. has by mistake *قدري* instead of *عدري*.

<sup>2</sup> Firishtah explains that Sultān Ghiyāth-ud-dīn, had, on account of his great age, lost his sense and intelligence.

<sup>3</sup> The name appears to be *بکنکالو*, Bakankālū in the MSS. and *بکبالو* Bakbakālū in the lith. ed. Firishtah in the corresponding passage has *در کمینگاه*, i.e., in some secret place. *کنکانو* Kankānū is adopted in the text-edition.

<sup>4</sup> I cannot make out whether *بارة* or *مارة* is the name of a place or otherwise.

<sup>5</sup> See note 3 above. At this place one MS. has *بموضع بلنکالو*, in the village of Balankālū, while the other has *بکنکالو* Bakankālū. The lith. ed. has *بموضع کنکالو* in the village of Kankālū.



would receive capital punishment; and if they went back to Mandū they were afraid of punishment by Rānī Khūrshīd in the immediate future. They were still wandering in the plains of amazement when they heard that Sultān Nāṣir-ud-dīn had left that place and had marched to and encamped in the town of <sup>1</sup> Thahnah. At this station, Malik Mahta and Malik Haibat, who were among the great *amīrs* of <sup>2</sup> the G̥hiyāth Shāhī state came and joined him; and the power and splendour of Nāṣir Shāh were much increased. From that station he moved to the town of <sup>3</sup> Rājāwiyah; and Maulānā 'Imād-ud-dīn Afdal Khān and a body of the *zamīndārs* <sup>4</sup> of that neighbourhood joined him there. He stayed there for a few days on account of the pleasant nature of the air, and the freshness and verdure of the fields; and had, with the consent of the *amīrs* the royal umbrella raised over his head, on the day of the 'Īd-i-ṣīr (the festivity of the breaking of the fast); and distinguished the *amīrs* and divines and heads of groups by bestowing valuable robes of honour on them.

At this time news was brought to him, that Shujā'at Khān's troops had started from the village of <sup>5</sup> Bakankālū with the intention of giving battle; and had arrived in the village of <sup>6</sup> Kandūyah.

<sup>1</sup> The name looks like تهنه Tahnah or نته Natnah in the MSS; and بهلیه Bhalīah in the lith. ed. M. Hidayat Ḥosain has هسته Hastah in the text-edition.

<sup>2</sup> One MS. has دولت غیاث الدین شاهی, while the other and the lith. ed. have دولت غیاث شاهی.

<sup>3</sup> The name is راجویه Rājāwiyah, in both MSS., while the lith. ed. has اجارنه Ajārnah; and the lith. ed. of Firishtah has جادیه Jādīah. M. Hidayat Ḥosain has آجایه Ajāiyah in the text-edition.

<sup>4</sup> The reading in one MS. is زمین داران ان ناحیه which I have adopted. The other MS. has الحنه Alhanah and the lith. ed. has ریخته Rēkhtah instead of ان ناحیه. Firishtah in the corresponding passage has زمینداران, some *zamīndārs*.

<sup>5</sup> The name is here written as کنگاتو Kankātū in one MS. and کیکالو Kikālū in the other, and بکیکالو Bakikālū in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has here کنگانور Kankānū.

<sup>6</sup> The name appears to be کندویه Kandūyah in the MS., and کندوبه Kandūbah in the lith. ed. In later passages it is written as کندویه Kandūyah in the MS., and I have adopted that name. Firishtah lith. ed. has کندوهر Kandūhar.

Nāṣir Shāh sent <sup>1</sup> Malik Malhū to chastise them. As the star of his fortune had become resplendent over the horizon of greatness, when the two armies met the breeze of victory and triumph blew over the plumes of Malik Malhū's standard; and the enemy fled and went to Mandū; and Malik Malhū joined Nāṣir Shāh's camp at Rājāwiyah, with much booty. On the 16th Shawwāl in the year 905 A.H., 1499 A.D., he marched from that station towards the town of <sup>2</sup> Aūjūd. Mubārak Khān and <sup>3</sup> Himmat Khān now came and joined him. And when he arrived in the town of Sundarsī, Rustam Khān, the governor of Sārangpūr, came and waited on him; and brought some elephants and much other property as a tribute. After his arrival at Ujjain, *amīrs* and *faujdārs* and *thānadārs* came to his threshold in great numbers. Rānī Khūrshīd and Shujā'at Khān (now) in fear of their lives, reported to Sultān Ghīyāth-ud-dīn, that Nāṣir Shāh had arrived at Ujjain, and all the *amīrs* and *thānadārs* had turned to him; and the fort of Shādīābād would be besieged in the near future.

Ghīyāth-ud-dīn sent Shaikh Auliya and Shaikh Burhān-ud-dīn as ambassadors, and sent the following message through them, "It is a long time since I have placed the bridle of the work of government in the grasp of my son's hand of power. If acting in a spirit of sincerity and attachment, he would send away the mob of common people, which has collected round him, and would come and wait on me, the affairs of the empire would again be entrusted to his penetrating intellect and judicious consideration. At that time, if he considers it advisable, he can allot the territory of Ranthambhōr to Shujā'at Khān, who stands in the relation of a son to him; and the flame of disturbance and revolt should be extinguished by the waters of peace." Nāṣir Shāh did not bind himself by any reply; and towards the end of Dhī-qa'dah of the aforesaid year, marched from the town of Ujjain to the town of Dhūr; and halted there for some days. About this time

<sup>1</sup> That is the name in both MSS. and in the lith. ed., but Firishtah lith. ed. has ملک محمود Malik Mahmūd.

<sup>2</sup> One MS. and the lith. ed. have the reading I have in the text; but the other MS. has بتوجه قصبه اوجود گشت instead of بتوجه پتن و راو موجود گشت. M. Hidayat Hosain has adopted اوجود Ajūd for اوجود in the text-edition.

<sup>3</sup> The name is همای خان and همت خان in the MSS. and محبان خان, without any dot above or below the third letter in the lith. ed. Firishtah does not name these men.

news came that <sup>1</sup> Yakān Khān had come down from Shādiābād, with three thousand horsemen, with the intention of giving battle. Immediately on hearing this news, Malik <sup>2</sup> 'Aṭan was sent with five hundred horsemen to the village of Hānspūr. Yakān Khān receiving information of this advanced towards Hānspūr. After a fight between them, Malik 'Aṭan was victorious; and <sup>3</sup> one hundred brave men out of Yakān Khān's troops, who knew men, were slain. Malik 'Aṭan seized eighty horses and much booty, and returned to the town of Dhār. Yakān Khān with the men who had escaped the sword fled and entered the fort. After a few days, Yakān Khān, at the incitement of Rānī Khūrshīd and Shujā'at Khān, again came out of the fort with a body of men whom he had got together, with the determination of fighting another battle. Immediately on hearing this news, Nāṣir Shāh nominated Khwājah <sup>4</sup> Suhail and Malik Mahta and Malik Haibat and Miyān Jiw to attack and crush Yakān Khān; but as soon as the eyes of the latter fell on Nāṣir Shāh's troops, his foot of firmness and stability slipped; and he fled without attempting to fight; and, in short, wherever the two sides met, the breezes of victory and triumph blew on the plumes of Nāṣir Shāh's standards.

On the 22nd of Dhī'l-hijjā-ul-ḥarām of the aforesaid year, (Sultān Nāṣir-ud-dīn) took up his quarters in the *Jahān-numā* <sup>5</sup> palace at

<sup>1</sup> See note 2, page 554. Here the name is لکان خان without any dot above or below the first letter in one MS. and یکان خان in the other MS., and نکان خان in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has مکهن خان as before, and describes him as the مادۀ فتنه و نزاع or the cause of all disturbance and dispute. I have adopted یکان خان.

<sup>2</sup> He is so called in both MSS. The lith. ed. has ملک عطا از عطی. The name of the village is هانسپور Hānspūr in one MS. and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah; هانسالپور Hānsalpūr in the other MS. and هانسلور Hānslūr in the lith. ed. of the Ṭabaqāt.

<sup>3</sup> The MSS. and the lith. ed. all have یکصد نفر مردانه مردم شناس. I do not understand the exact meaning of these words. Firishtah simply has یکصد سپاهی مکهن خان.

<sup>4</sup> The names are as I have got them in the text in one MS. There are slight differences as regards the second and the fourth in the other MS. and in the lith. ed. Firishtah does not give the names, though he mentions the second attempt.

<sup>5</sup> One MS. has کوشک, while the other MS. and the lith. ed. have کوشک.

Na'lcha. At this station his spies brought the news, that Sultān Ghīyāth-ud-dīn, in his old elegant person, intended to come, in order to comfort and counsel his son (*i.e.*, Nāṣir-ud-dīn); and in order to carry out this intention he had moved from the capital, and had taken up his residence <sup>1</sup> in the centre of the kingdom; and he would move from the place at a moment which the astrologers had selected; and after trying to please his son's heart he would return to Shādiābād. Nāṣir Shāh was pleased and delighted on hearing this news; and waited in expectation of the joy-giving arrival of his father; but Shujā'at Khān, with the advice of Rānī Khūrshīd, had the Sultān's litter taken up and had it carried towards Na'lcha. When they arrived at the Dehlī gate, and as age and senility had overcome the Sultān, he asked those who were near him, where they were taking him to. Some of them informed him of what had happened. He said, "I will go another day. You should turn back to-day." The servants having no alternative turned back. When Rānī Khūrshīd heard that Sultān Ghīyāth-ud-dīn had returned from the way, she knew that this had happened at the incitement of Nāṣir Shāh's well-wishers. She summoned the men into her presence, and having used harsh words towards them demanded the reason of their action. They said that the Sultān had returned according to his own wishes; and no one else had any hand in the matter.

Shujā'at Khān, then with the advice and consent of Rānī Khūrshīd repaired the broken and ruined parts of the fort, and distributed the bastions (among his commanders). Nāṣir Shāh also advanced from his position, and arranged batteries round the fort. Everyday numbers of men were slain from each side. Sultān Ghīyāth-ud-dīn sent the ablest of the judges, Mashīr-ul-mulk, to arrange for peace; but, as he did not get a reply like what he wanted, and was afraid of Rānī Khūrshīd, he remained where he was. As the siege became close, and the garrison was in great anxiety and distress owing to the non-arrival of grain and other necessities; and bearing in mind the purport of the text, that change is best even though it may go against us, directed their attention to this, that the office of the Sultān

---

<sup>1</sup> The actual words are صفه عرض ممالک. I cannot find out the exact meaning of the first two words.



After some days, the sons of Shēr K̲hān, son of Muẓaffar K̲hān, the governor of Chandēri came and joined the camp of Nāṣir Shāh with one thousand horsomen and eleven elephants. In the first *majlis* after their arrival, Nāṣir Shāh conferred the title of Muẓaffar K̲hān on the elder, and As'd K̲hān on the second son. Owing to the arrival of the army of Chandēri, new vigour and strength, appeared in the men of the army. At this time some men in the garrison of Mandū, who had the charge of guarding the <sup>1</sup> Mālpūr gate, sent a notice to the besieging army, that if Nāṣir Shāh's troops came in that direction, the fort will come to his possession without any difficulty or trouble. Sultān Nāṣir Shāh sent Mubārak K̲hān and Shaikh Ḥabīb-ul-lah and Muwāfiq K̲hān and K̲h̲wāja Suhail and a number of others on the night of the 24th of Rabī'ul-ākhir of the afore-mentioned year. Shaikh Ḥabīb-ul-lah told them, that if they succeeded in capturing the fort, he would send his ring, that they might know that the fort had come into their possession. When the *amīrs* reached the gate, the citizens, in concert with Zabardast K̲hān son of Hazbar K̲hān who had charge of the *silāḥkhāna* (armoury) of the fort, slow the keeper of the Mālpūr gate and opened it; and Nāṣir Shāh's men galloped into the fort.

Shujā'at K̲hān with his army in battle array advanced to fight, but was unable to do anything; and fled and got into his own house, and then taking his family and children with him retired into the harem of Sultān Ghiyāth-ud-dīn. Shaikh Ḥabīb-ul-lah, then according to previous arrangement, sent his ring; and brought Nāṣir Shāh in. He reached the Mālpūr gate in a moment and got into the city. The *amīrs* hastened to wait on him, and offered their congratulations. Some foolish men set fire to some of the palaces and mansions of Sultān Ghiyāth-ud-dīn, <sup>2</sup> without any order from Nāṣir Shāh; and they seized and brought Shujā'at K̲hān and Rānī K̲h̲ūrshīd and some other persons; and having commenced to plunder and ransack the city devastated it for two days. Sultān Ghiyāth-ud-dīn then made up his mind and formed a determination, and moved from the place to the palace of Sarsatī and took up his abode there.

<sup>1</sup> One of the MSS. has بالپور Bālpūr instead of مالپور Mālpūr. The Cambridge History of India, page 363, calls it the Bālāpur gate.

<sup>2</sup> One MS. and the lith. ed. have بی امر ناصر شاهی, while the other MS. has بی استصواب و حکم ناصر شاهی.

On the 3rd day, which was <sup>1</sup> Friday the 27th of Rabi'-ul-ākhir of the afore-mentioned year, Sultān Nāṣir-ud-dīn sat on the throne of the empire and <sup>2</sup> made over Shujā'at Khān and Rānī Khūrshid to custodians. He sent Malik Mahta to Na'lcha (to bring) his <sup>3</sup> second son, who was known as Miyān Manjhla; and making the latter his heir, conferred on him the title of Sultān Shihāb-ud-dīn. He allotted to him the *Ṣafa Bāgh*, which was situated near the palace of Sultān Ghiyāth-ud-dīn as his residence. The same day the *Khuṭba* was read in the name of Nāṣir Shāh; and pearls and other gems, which were showered over his umbrella, were distributed among deserving men. Yakān Khān and Amman and Muḥāfiẓ Khān Jadid and Mufarraḥ Pidar Ḥabshī and other men, who had been hostile to him, were punished with death; and some men were brought away from under the sword, and were kept in imprisonment. According to the established custom he confirmed fiefs <sup>4</sup> on the men who had sided with him. He conferred on Shaikh Ḥabīb-ul-lah the title of 'Ālam Khān; and to Khwājah Suhail to whom he <sup>5</sup> had given the *pargana* of Āshtah, he gave the post of *Sipahsālārī* (office of commander-in-chief). On the 3rd of Jamādi-ul-ākhir of the afore-mentioned year, Sultān Nāṣir-ud-dīn was honoured by being allowed to do homage to his father and benefactor Sultān Ghiyāth-ud-dīn. The latter took him into his arms, and wept a great deal, and kissed his head and face; and on giving him permission to retire, bestowed on him the cap of state and the

<sup>1</sup> Firishtah lith. ed. gives the same day and date. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 240) also has Rubbee-ood-Sany 27, A.H. 906, October 25, A.D. 1500, as the date of Sultan Nasir-ood-Deen's accession. The Cambridge History of India, page 363, has October 22nd, 1500.

<sup>2</sup> Nizām-ud-dīn does not appear to mention the execution of Shujā'at Khān but Firishtah mentions it. See note 552. Col. Briggs says Shoojat Khan and "all his children and the whole family" were put to death. The Cambridge History of India that Shujā'at Khān was put to death.

<sup>3</sup> Neither Nizām-ud-dīn nor Firishtah give any reason for the selection of the second son as the latter was so to the eldest son, or whether

<sup>4</sup> Or

<sup>5</sup>

1 robe of woven hair, which he used himself to wear on the days of public audience and other auspicious days; and placing the royal crown on his head made over to him the keys of the treasury, and offering him felicitations and congratulations bade him adieu.

On the 16th of Rajab of the afore-said year, he bestowed on Sultān Shihāb-ud-dīn the same fur cloth robe and the cap of state, and also gave him twenty elephants and one hundred horses and eleven royal umbrellas, two *pālīs* and also a standard and a kettle-drum and a red pavilion and twenty *lakhs* of *tinukas* for his household expenses.

After a few days Muqbil Khān, the governor of Mandesōr 2 fled owing to his extreme misfortune; and Mahābat Khān, in whose charge he was, was sent immediately that he might seize and bring him back, with the threat that otherwise he should expect the thunderbolts of punishment. Mahābat Khān made great exertions, but (being unsuccessful) went and joined Shēr Khān (the governor of Chandēri). 'Alī Khān and some other men of evil destiny, who were suspicious and afraid owing to their evil deeds, also went and joined Shēr Khān. The latter marched from the neighbourhood of Na'leha and advanced towards Chandēri. Sultān Nasir-ud-dīn sent Mubārak Khān and 'Alam Khān to Shēr Khān, so that they might, in any way that they could, reassure him. Although they gave him words of sage counsel, he spoke rare words in answer to all their arguments; and wanted to imprison both of them. On the pretext that he was going to consult

1 The lith. ed. has کلا دولت before قباى مویند, which, however, is printed as قباى سونیه in it. The MSS. omit کلا دولت, though they mention it a little later. I have therefore retained it. مویند appears to mean made of woven cloth of hair, and Firishlah explains the importance of sanctity of this robe by saying ار بابت سید محمد نور بخش, i.e., appertaining to Sayid Muhammad Nūr Baksh.

2 Firishlah says نورد وزیر, but like Nizām-ud-dīn, he gives no reason for this. Col. Briggs quotes in a note (vol. IV, p. 241) some of the intrigues and fighting between Nasir-ood-Deen on the one side, and Shoojat Khan and Rany Khoorsheed on the other, from the Muntakhib-oot-Towareekh; and says these are not mentioned by Firishlah, although as a matter of fact they are. The Cambridge History of India, page 361, says that the *amīrs* declined to believe that Sultān Nāsir-ud-dīn "had ascended the throne with his father's consent", and, therefore, rebelled. Firishlah does not say that Muqbil Khān was in charge of Mahābat Khān. He however agrees with the text in saying that he was sent to bring the latter.



with his mother, he came out of the pavilion, and made over Mubārak Khān and 'Ālam Khān to his own men. The latter seized Mubārak Khān, and slew two of his servants. 'Ālam Khān took the opportunity to get to his horse; and with great quickness came out of the camp, and reported the matter to Sultān Nāṣir-ud-dīn. The latter left his son Sultān Shihāb-ud-dīn, in charge of the government of the fort of Shādhābād; and took up his quarters, on the 9th Sha'bhān of the afore-mentioned year, in the *Jahān-numā* palace at Na'leha. When Shēr Khān arrived in the fort of Ujjain, he again, at the instigation of Mahābat Khān turned back to give battle, and came to Dībālpūr, and plundered the town of Hindīah. Immediately on hearing this, Sultān Nāṣir-ud-dīn marched forward, and took up his residence in the palace of Dhār.

At this time they brought the news that Sultān Ghiyāth-ud-dīn had passed away from the waste place of the world to the popular land of after-world. According to one statement he was poisoned at the instance of Sultān Nāṣir-ud-dīn. <sup>1</sup> It is a matter of experience that a parricide never attains to old age and never becomes successful. Sultān Nāṣir-ud-dīn ruled for <sup>2</sup> eleven years. Therefore the allegation of his attempt on the life of his father may be a mere calumny, but knowledge is with God alone.

In short, Sultān Nāṣir-ud-dīn wept much at the death of his father, and was in mourning for three days. <sup>3</sup> On the 4th day he

<sup>1</sup> Firishtah gives the same reason for disbelieving the guilt of Sultān Nāṣir-ud-dīn; but he is not so positive as Nizām-ud-dīn as he prefixes the word شارب perhaps, to the sentence about Sultān Nāṣir-ud-dīn's innocence. Col. Briggs thinks that it is not just to accuse him of that crime; while the Cambridge History of India (p. 364) says that the poison was "administered, as it was generally believed, by his orders." One would have thought, that seeing that the father was so weak in body and mind, and so helpless, it would be futile and unnecessary to cause his death; but there is the fact that some of the nobles rebelled, because they believed that Nāṣir-ud-dīn had not ascended the throne with his father's consent.

<sup>2</sup> Both MSS. have سیزده سال 13 years, but the lith. ed. has یازده سال 11 years. Firishtah lith. ed. has many years. As Nāṣir-ud-dīn's reign lasted from 905 to 916 A.H., the reading in the lith. ed. is correct and I have retained it.

<sup>3</sup> Firishtah lith. ed. agrees generally with the text as to the Sultān's proceeding against Shēr Khān. Col. Briggs however (vol. IV, p. 241) says

started on his march; and Shēr Khān in <sup>1</sup> fear of his life turned back to his own country. 'Ain-ul-mulk and some other *sardārs* separated from him and joined the camp of <sup>2</sup> Nāṣir Shāh. The latter pursued Shēr Khān, and the latter turned back in the neighbourhood of Sārangpūr to engage him; and after doing so, fled. He could not stand firm in Chandēri itself, and went away to the country of Erij and Bhāndir; and the dust of the disturbance settled down; and Sultān Nāṣir-ud-dīn went to Chandēri. When some days had passed, the Shaikhzādas of Chandēri sent a letter to Shēr Khān, saying, that as most of the Shādīābād troops had dispersed, and had gone away to their *jāgīrs*; and as, owing to the rains, the *amīrs* would not be able to assemble quickly, if he would come to Chandēri, and the men of the city, should in conjunction with him come out in great numbers, it was probable that they would be able to seize Sultān Nāṣir-ud-dīn; and even if he should escape, the city could be conquered in a very easy way. Shēr Khān without any delay marched out and arrived within six *karōhs* of Chandēri. Sultān Nāṣir-ud-dīn <sup>3</sup> became acquainted with the consultations of the Shaikhzādas, and appointed Iqbāl Khān and Mallū Khān with a well-equipped army and *mast* elephants to get rid of Shēr Khān; and sent two *lakhs* of *tankas* in cash with them to defray their expenses. They had not yet gone two *karōhs*, when Shēr Khān relying on the statements of

that Sheer Khan's adherents "wrote to him that the King had retreated to Mando on account of the rains." This is not correct. The Cambridge History of India, page 364, says that, "After an unsuccessful attempt to crush this rebellion, and another attempt, equally unsuccessful, to conciliate the rebels, he took the field against them." This also is incorrect, if Nizām-ud-dīn and Firishtah are correct. Neither of them speaks of the first unsuccessful attempt to crush the rebellion.

<sup>1</sup> Both MSS. have وهم جان, which I have adopted, but the lith. ed. has بیم جان.

<sup>2</sup> The MSS. have Nāṣir Shāh, and Nāṣir Shāhī; and the lith. ed. has Nāṣir-ud-dīn.

<sup>3</sup> The MSS. as well as the lith. ed. have اطلاع نموده, which does not appear to be quite correct. Firishtah lith. ed. has اطلاع یافتہ which is better, and I have adopted it. In the text-edition. M. Hidayat Ḥosain has retained اطلاع نموده.

the Shaikhzādas came forward to meet them; and after the arraying of the troops the two sides fought bravely. In the midst of the struggle, Shēr Khān happened to receive a wound, became disabled, and <sup>1</sup> got the fruit of his rebellion. <sup>2</sup> Sikandar Khān was killed in the battle-field. Khwājah Suhail and Mahābat Khān placed the wounded Shēr Khān in a box (some sort of *howdah*) on the back of an elephant and took the way of flight. As Shēr Khān died on the way, they buried him, and went on in their flight. Iqbāl Khān returned after pursuing them for some distance. Sultān Nāṣir-ud-dīn was delighted and pleased on hearing this news; and went to the battle-field, and <sup>3</sup> from there sent Sikandar Khān to Chandēri, so that he might expose Shēr Khān's body on a gallows. He placed the bridle of the government and defence of that territory in the grasp of power of <sup>4</sup> Bihjat Khān; and marching by successive stages arrived in the pleasant town of <sup>5</sup> Sa'dulpūr. There some men reported to him, that Shaikh Ḥabib-ul-lah, <sup>6</sup> who had the title of 'Ālam Khān, intended to act treacherously, and was waiting for an opportunity. Sultān

<sup>1</sup> The words in one MS. and in the lith. ed. are *و نتیجه بغی کار خود کرد*. The other MS. incorrectly omits the verb *کرد*; but in either case the meaning is rather obscure. I think, however, my translation is correct. Firishtah lith. ed. in the corresponding passage omits this semi-moral observation.

<sup>2</sup> It is not stated who he was. Firishtah in the corresponding passage says *که عمداً ان قوم بود*. Firishtah agrees generally with the text in respect of the battle and the incidents preceding and following it: and so do Col. Briggs and the Cambridge History of India.

<sup>3</sup> Firishtah differs slightly, and says that the Sultān went to the battle field, exhumed Shēr Khān's body, and sent it to Chandēri, so that it might be suspended from the gallows there.

<sup>4</sup> Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 242) calls him Himmut Khan; and the Cambridge History of India, page 364, has Bihjat Khān.

<sup>5</sup> Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 242) calls the place Adilpoor. It is not mentioned in the Cambridge History of India.

<sup>6</sup> The actual words are *نسبت بعالم خان* in both MSS. and in the lith ed. I do not actually understand the meaning of the word *نسبت* in this context. Firishtah has in the corresponding passage *شیخ حبیب الله المخاطب بعالم خان* which is perfectly clear, and I have translated the passage accordingly. M. Hidayat Ḥosain has retained the reading of the manuscripts, but refers to a variant *ملقب* instead of *نسبت* in another MS.

Nāṣir-ud-dīn imprisoned him, and sent him to Mandū, in advance of himself.

On the 10th Sha'bān 907 A.H., he entered the fort of Shādīābād attended with victory and triumph. He then occupied himself with pleasure and dissipation, and most of his time was spent in the drinking of spirituous liquor. In his drinks, he ordered his father's *amīrs* to be murdered owing to a suspicion of their treachery; and he supported and favoured his own men. His immorality and tyranny reached such a pitch, that one <sup>1</sup> day, when drunk he was asleep on the bank of a reservoir. By accident he fell into it. His attendants, who were watching him, brought him out of the water. When he came to his senses, he asked who had taken him out. Four slave girls told him, "We performed this service." He ordered all four of them to be executed. He had heard from the chief men of Ujjain (apparently the reservoir was in that city and this incident occurred there), that that reservoir or tank was the Kaliyādah. He <sup>2</sup> planned the erection of a palace there, in the *Bāgh Fīrūz*, of such grandeur, that people, who had travelled over the inhabited fourth part of earth, never saw anything like it. Gradually his desire for building reached such a point, that out of the seventeen *krōrs* of Mālwa money, which had come to him by inheritance, he spent five *krōrs* on different structures.

On the 22nd Dhī-qa'dah 908 A.H., he came to the town of Na'lcha with the intention of destroying the country of <sup>3</sup> Kachwārah. And

<sup>1</sup> Firishtah narrates this incident in greater detail. According to him, the Sultān rolled into the water, and the four slave girls pulled him out, some seizing hold of his hands, and the others the hair of his head. They also put him into dry clothes. When he recovered his senses he complained of headache, and the slave girls, hoping for a reward, told him what had happened, after the usual prayers and praise; he flew into a rage, drew his sword, and cut down the poor and helpless slave girls. And then Firishtah indulges in three couplets, expressing the woes of the hapless women, and their having their revenge on the day of resurrection.

<sup>2</sup> Firishtah does not mention the erection of the wonderful palace and the other buildings.

<sup>3</sup> The name is written as کچھوارہ, and کچھوارہ in the MS. and کچھوار in the lith. ed. both of the *Ṭabaqāt* and of *Firishtah*. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 243) has Keechiwara. The Cambridge History of India does not mention this invasion at all.



perverted destiny; and came out of the fort of Mandū. The *amīrs* of the frontier districts mostly joined him, and he marched from the town of Na'leha to the town of Dhār. Sultān Nāṣir-ud-dīn arrived there with a body of his special troops; and from that place he advanced towards Dhār, with the intention of giving battle. Sultān Shihāb-ud-dīn, considering that his father's followers were weak, advanced to engage him; but in the end, the breeze of victory and triumph blew on the plumes of Nāṣir Shāh's standards. Sultān Shihāb-ud-dīn fled towards Chandēri. The brave warriors in Nāṣir Shāh's army pursued him; and were about to take him prisoner, but (on account of) fatherly love and paternal affection (he) forbade the men from further pursuit.

On the following day he marched from that station and went forward. When Sultān Shihāb-ud-dīn arrived in the town of <sup>1</sup>Sipri, Sultān Nāṣir-ud-dīn sent a number of wise men to him, so that they might instruct him, and lead him from the by-path of error to the high-road of guidance. But as the way of righteousness was hidden from his side and the veil of negligence and of the love of splendour had been drawn down on his eyes, he never gave a reply that might be of any use. On the following day he sent a reply, "At present his shame and self-abasement prevent his acquiring the good fortune of waiting on Your Majesty. If a small part out of the many portions of the empire be bestowed on this slave; he would after a few days honour himself by rendering homage." When the men who had been sent knew that it would be impossible to bring about an interview, they came back and reported the matter. Sultān Nāṣir-ud-dīn said, "Verily we are for God, and verily we shall return to him."

Hemistich:

The soil devoured the seed that in hope of thee I sowed.

He then sent a *farmān* to Ranthambhōr to summon Ā'zam Humāyūn, his younger son. The latter came on wings of speed and steps of eagerness and waited on his father near Chandēri. Sultān

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the place is written as *سپری* in one or two places in the MSS. and in the lith. ed., but as *سپری* in other places. The Cambridge History of India, page 364, also has Sipri. Firishlah lith. ed. and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 244) both have "Dehly" instead of Sipri. This of course is incorrect.

Nāṣir-ud-dīn started from Chandēri on the following day: and advanced to the town of Sipri. At that station, he ordered the attendance of the *amīrs* and the great men of the city; and said, "As Shihāb-ud-dīn has made undutifulness and revolt the return for paternal love, I am removing him from the position of the heir apparent; and I am making my son Āḡzam Humāyūn my heir." He then gave him the title of Sultān Maḥmūd Shāh, and bestowed a robe and the crown of the empire on him: and returning from the town of Sipri resided for some days in the village of <sup>1</sup> Behishtpūr. <sup>2</sup> As the temperature of Sultān Nāṣir-ud-dīn was high, and as in spite of the fact of its being the winter, he got into cold water and remained in it for a moment, his health immediately turned from the normal; and various diseases and ailments with mutually opposed results attacked him. Although the physicians tried to effect a cure, they had no success.

Couplet:

§ Oxy-mal, by fate's decree, increased his bile.

The oil of almonds dryness produced.

Sultān Nāṣir-ud-dīn, seeing that his condition was unsatisfactory sent for Maḥmūd Shāh, and the *amīrs* and the great men of the country to his presence: and opening his lips to give utterance to counsels and precepts said: "<sup>4</sup> As the great and holy God has selected this excellent

<sup>1</sup> The name is بهشت پور in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah: and نهب پور in the lith. ed. of the Ṭabaqāt. Col. Briggs (vol. IV. p. 244) has Burtpoor. The name of the place is not mentioned in the Cambridge History of India.

<sup>2</sup> Firishtah's account agrees with that in the text, but he surmises that the fever was caused از افراط شراب یا از عفونت اخلاط و تصرف هوا i.e., from excessive drinking or from infection of the humours of the body or the influence of the air. Col. Briggs's account (so far it goes) agrees with that in the text. The Cambridge History of India, pages 364, 365, gives two accounts of the manner of Sultān Nāṣir-ud-dīn's death. The first agrees with that in the text. According to the other he suspected many of his nobles to be secretly in correspondence with Shihāb-ud-dīn, and threatened them, so that they became apprehensive and poisoned him. I have not seen this said anywhere else.

<sup>3</sup> A mixture of honey and vinegar prescribed for the bile.

<sup>4</sup> Firishtah does not ascribe any speech to the Sultān, and considering the latter's disposition and habits, and his condition at the time, it is not likely that he could make such a sensible and eloquent address. However, as it is there, I have translated it.

son (of mine) from the entire people of the world, and has entrusted the bridle of the affairs of all people to his grasp of power, it behoves him, that he should not place his foot out of the high-road of worship of, and submission to God; and should not become subject to lust and sensuality; and should write the text of 'love to the people of God' on the leaf of his mind and the page of his heart. He should also not withhold the favour of God from the people, as it has not been withheld from him. He should also shorten his hand from the skirts of the oppressed. He should not in his public audiences give way to hesitation and weariness; and should not close the path of approach of the oppressed to him; and should properly listen to their words. He should not also, in administering justice and equity, allow any difference between the weak and the strong, and the high and the low; so that he may not become ashamed on the day of the judgment. He should also treat with honour and respect all Saiyids who are the fruits of the garden of the prophetship and of the emissary of God; and should make the high society of the learned, who are the heirs of the prophet, green and fruitful by the beneficence of the clouds of his rewards. He should also consider it right and proper to refrain from the society of stupid and foolish men, who are satisfied with husk of words; and are ignorant and unmindful of the purity and greatness of saints. He should also lay the foundation of houses of piety and goodness, which are the effects of one's good fortune, in all parts of the dominions. In short, he should devote all his energy in carrying out the wishes of God; and in the administration of the affairs of the state always take counsel (with wise men)." Shāhzādah Maḥmūd Shāh and the great men of the kingdom were in great pain and anguish on hearing this speech. (The Sultān) then, with a true determination and a right resolution made repentance of all his sins and iniquities in the presence of the learned men, and after a moment accepted the summons of the just God. The period of his reign was eleven years and four months and twenty <sup>1</sup> three days.

Couplets:

From the cold earth, rose this palace grand;  
But as you make it warm they tell you "rise"!

---

<sup>1</sup> Firishtah lith. ed. has eleven years and four months and three days and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 244) has eleven years and four months.



As this world of dust has such foundations weak,  
Soon should it be scattered to the wings, and ruin be.

AN ACCOUNT OF SULTĀN MAḤMŪD SHĀH, SON OF NĀṢIR SHĀH.

On the <sup>1</sup>3rd day of Ṣafar in the year 917 A.H., Maḥmūd Shāh, the son of Nāṣir Shāh, ascended the throne of the Khaljī empire, in the village of Behishtpūr, with <sup>2</sup>an auspicious and triumphant fortune and at a happy time. The rites of thanks-offering and of wave-offering having been performed, each one of the great men of the age was made happy with royal beneficence; and from the same *majlis* sent the coffin of Nāṣir Shāh to the fort of Shādīābād.

<sup>3</sup> Sultān Shihāb-ud-dīn on becoming acquainted with the event (*Hāditha*, i.e., probably his father's death), betook himself from where he was by rapid marches, to Naṣratābād Na'lcha. Muḥāfiẓ Khān *Khawājah Sarā* and Khawās Khān shut the gates in his face. On the following day, he sent a message to them, by one of his immediate attendants, that if they would act in friendship with him, it <sup>4</sup>was certain, that the loosening and fastening of the affairs of the state would be entrusted to their wisdom. Muḥāfiẓ Khān and Khawās Khān said, "As the ordinance of the empire, has been recorded in

<sup>1</sup> Neither Firishtah nor Col. Briggs nor the Cambridge History of India gives the date of the accession.

<sup>2</sup> There is some difference in the readings. One MS. has بطالع فرخنده فیروز. This I have adopted. The other MS. substitutes فر زمانی سعادت اثر for فیروز. The lith. ed. has فرود در زمان سعادت اثر.

<sup>3</sup> The Cambridge History of India, page 365, says "Shihāb-ud-dīn, on hearing of his father's death, returned to Mālwa and marched on Māndū, but Mahmud II outstripped him and arrived there first, and when Shihāb-ud-dīn reached the city, the gates were shut in his face." This appears to me to contain more than one inaccuracy. There was no race between the brothers; and it was the gates of Na'lcha and not of Māndū that were shut in Shihāb-ud-dīn's face by Muḥāfiẓ Khān, who was the governor of the former place and not of the latter. It is true that Col. Briggs also says that the gates of Māndo were shut in his face and Mahafiz Khan refused him admission. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 246) also says that immediately after this the Prince "fled to Aseer", and says nothing about his defeat by Jāwash Khān. The Cambridge History of India appears here to follow Col. Briggs and does not refer to the Ṭabaqāt or Firishtah at all.

<sup>4</sup> Both MSS. omit است after یقین; but I have retained it.

the renowned name of Maḥmūd Shāh, in the office of destiny and fate, the best course is that you should join the camp (of Sultān Maḥmūd); and should change the foulness and roughness of a strange man for the purity of friendship.” <sup>1</sup> Sultān Shihāb-ud-dīn becoming despondent retired towards Kandāsah. <sup>2</sup> When Sultān Maḥmūd knew that Sultān Shihāb-ud-dīn had gone away towards Mandū, he marched by successive stages and took up his residence in *Jahān-numā* kiosk of Na'icha, on the 2nd Rabi'-ul-awwal of the afore-mentioned year.

From there he sent <sup>3</sup> Jāwash Khān with a detachment of troops to crush Sultān Shihāb-ud-dīn, and he sent eleven elephants with him. He then went to the fort of Shādīābād, on a date which had been selected by the astrologers, and at an auspicious moment on the 6th Rabi'-ul-awwal, had the golden throne, encrusted with gems and pomegranate-colour rubies, in the open plain near the audience hall, and <sup>4</sup> had twenty-one other thrones raised around it, and Maḥmūd Shāh ascended the throne of the Khālji Sultāns from the east of the

<sup>1</sup> One MS. omits the whole sentence from سلطان to شد. The name of the place is کندوهه Kandūhah in the MS. which has the sentence, and کندویه Kandūyah in the lith. ed. Firishtah is very brief here and does not mention the place.

<sup>2</sup> There is much difference in the readings. One MS. has سلطان محمود بمندو از نوشته سلطان محمود واقف شد که سلطان شهاب الدین بمندو رفته بکوچ سلطان محمود چون واقف شد که سلطان شهاب الدین بمندو رفته بکوچ. The reading in the first MS. is manifestly incorrect, and there is not much to choose between the other two, but on the whole I think the reading of the lith. ed. is the best.

<sup>3</sup> The name is جاوش خان in one MS., and in several places in the other. In the latter it is جلوس خان in one place. The lith. ed. has جادوش خان. The expedition against Sultān Shihāb-ud-dīn is not mentioned by either Firishtah or Col. Briggs or in the Cambridge History of India.

<sup>4</sup> I have translated the text as it is in the MSS. and in the lith. ed.; but I am very doubtful about its correctness. I cannot understand the reference to the twenty-one thrones, and also to the rising of Maḥmūd Shāh from the east of the throne of the empire. As regards the rising of Maḥmūd Shāh from the east the reading from Firishtah is a great improvement. It is واقف دولت و. محمود شاه از افق سرزیر جهاندارى طالع گشت. Probably the correct reading of the Ṭabaqāt was something like this. As to the twenty-one thrones, I cannot hazard any explanation.



did not maintain the usual relations towards <sup>1</sup> the army, and did not leave out any minutiae of meanness and mischief-making; and having adopted a harshness of behaviour did not show proper respect towards the *amīrs* and *sardārs*. The latter, having availed themselves of an opportunity, killed him in the audience hall on the 7th Rabi'-ul-*thānī*. <sup>2</sup> Naqd-ul-mulk, who was of the same religion as Basant Rāy, and the latter's colleague in service, fled into the harem of the Sultān. Iqbāl *Khān* and <sup>3</sup> Mukhtaṣ *Khān* talked together, and said, "Unless the kingdom is purified of the contamination of the existence of this impure one, he will always be in ambush for taking revenge for Basant Rāy." They sent the following message to the Sultān by Ṣadr *Khān* and Afḍal *Khān*, "Nothing has been done, and nothing will be done by these loyal slaves, except in the way of a sincere desire for Your Majesty's well-being, and it must be clear to your illuminating wisdom, that as the affairs (of the kingdom) have not been well arranged, the act of leaving the threads of the administration in the grasp of people who are strangers to us in creed and religion, is (likely to be) the cause of disorder in the conduct of government. It has probably been submitted to Your Majesty by some of your well-wishers, what kind of treatment Basant Rāy meted out to the *amīrs* and to your other loyal adherents. His sole object was, that your old servants might become heart-broken; and they and their retainers might be

---

been the minister of Nāṣir Shāh also. The *Ṭabaqāt* says he did not show the usual courtesy towards the army, and left out no minutiae of دقائق کفایت according to the MSS. and, according to lith. ed., of نکایت . دقیقه appears to mean littleness or meanness; کفایت economy or thrift; and نکایت means mischief-making. I have adopted نکایت in the translation. Firishtah says the other *amīrs* became hostile to him lest he become too powerful (مبادا تقرب و تسلط بهم رساند). Col. Briggs says he was a personal favourite of the King, and had attended him from the period of his birth; and he also says that the conspirators declared that he had laid a scheme to overturn the government. The Cambridge History of India, page 365, is satisfied with saying that the Muslim nobles resented his holding the high office of minister.

<sup>1</sup> One MS. has quite incorrectly جانب ساء instead of جانب سپاء.

<sup>2</sup> Firishtah lith. ed. also calls him Naqd-ul-mulk; but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 246) has Nizam-ool-Moolk. He is not mentioned in the Cambridge History of India.

<sup>3</sup> It is مخصومان instead of Mukhtaṣ *Khān* in the text-edition.

dispersed. This was in fact disloyalty on his part; and we your loyal servants, in a body, removed him out of the way. Naqd-ul-mulk is also following in his footsteps. If it be your noble order, the world might be purified of the contamination of his existence." Sultān Maḥmūd in his weakness and helplessness sent Naqd-ul-mulk to the *amīrs*; but he ordered that he might be externed, and no injury caused to his life or property. When they brought Naqd-ul-mulk, <sup>1</sup>the *amīrs*, acting in a body, expelled him. Sultān Maḥmūd was aggrieved at these proceedings of the *amīrs*, and at their domination; and the purity of his heart was changed to resentment.

Muḥāfiẓ Khān, eunuch, the combination of whose disposition was made up of malice and wickedness, <sup>2</sup>owing to his longing for the *vazārat*, reported (to the Sultān), in private, words that were not true <sup>3</sup>in respect of the *amīrs*. It so happened, that one day availing himself of an opportunity, he represented to the Sultān, that Iqbāl Khān and <sup>4</sup>Mukhtaṣ Khān wanted to raise one of the (other) sons of Nāṣir Shāh on the throne. Sultān Maḥmūd, simply on hearing this news, became anxious; and wanted to punish the two ministers. But afterwards acting with patience and calmness, he set about making enquiries and investigations.

When Muḥāfiẓ Khān saw, that his words had not produced any result, he grew more insistent in his calumnies; and every day made use of harsh words, till one day Sultān Maḥmūd ordered some people,

<sup>1</sup> Firishtah says that to this extent they tried to please the Sultān.

<sup>2</sup> Firishtah lith. ed. is not explicit about Muḥāfiẓ Khān's motive; and neither Col. Briggs nor the Cambridge History of India says what his motive was. Firishtah and Col. Briggs say nothing about Muḥāfiẓ Khān's intrigues against Mukhtaṣ Khān and Iqbāl Khān; but they say that he quarrelled with the Sultān and used unmannerly language towards him. After some fighting the Sultān had to leave Shādīābād; and Muḥāfiẓ Khān then brought Ṣāhib Khān out of the fort, and raised him to the throne. According to the *Ṭabaqāt* this happened sometime afterwards, *i.e.*, after the rebellion of Iqbāl Khān and Mukhtaṣ Khān and the death of Sultān Shihāb-ud-dīn, and the submission of a petition by Iqbāl Khān and Mukhtaṣ Khān. The Cambridge History of India mentions the intrigues of Muḥāfiẓ Khān and the rebellion of Iqbāl Khān and Mukhtaṣ Khan, etc. (p. 365).

<sup>3</sup> The reading in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. is *از امراء* but I think the meaning is about or in respect of the *amīrs*.

<sup>4</sup> *مختصر خان* in the second MS.

ābād. They gave the title of Hūshang Shāh to <sup>1</sup> the adopted son of Sultān Shihāb-ud-dīn, and held the umbrella over his head; and raising the dust of disturbance, started from that country towards the centre of the country of Mālwa.

<sup>2</sup> Couplet:

Jāmf! it is better that at this stage you adopt the view,  
That from the deaths of others, you fear your own.

After the arrival of the dead body, the Sultān wept much, and deposited it in the earth. He carried out the customary rites of mourning, and gave alms to deserving people. After finishing them, he sent Nizām Khān to reinforce Dastūr Khān. Nizām Khān traversed the stages on wings of speed and joined him. Then joining their forces, they attacked Hūshang; and the latter fled, and took shelter in <sup>3</sup> the hills of Bahār Bāhā Hājī.

While these things were happening, petitions came from Iqbāl Khān and Muḥittas Khān, to the effect that, "Nothing has ever been done by these ancient hereditary slaves except rendering loyal service to your Majesty, and Muḥāfiz Khān, owing to his envy and ill-will, having spoken interested and malicious words has turned your noble heart against your old servants. They hope that the truth about the disloyalty and <sup>4</sup> wickedness of Muḥāfiz Khān and of his acts will be revealed to your just mind. They also believe that some of your other loyal servants, will, in their disinterestedness, attest in private

<sup>1</sup> Both MSS. have *معتبى*, adopted son, but the lith. ed. has *پسر*, son. *The Cambridge History of India*, page 365, also has son.

<sup>2</sup> The meaning and appropriateness of the couplet are not very clear. Also the first word is either *جامی*, which is the name of the celebrated Persian Sāfi poet who was a native of Jām, or *جایی* a place. I think Jāmf is better.

<sup>3</sup> *Farishtah* lith. ed. has *به کوهها گریختند* fled to the hills. He goes on to say that after some time Iqbāl Khān and Muḥṣuṣ Khān joined the service of Sultān Mahmūd, and were received with favour. Somewhat contrary to this, Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 250) says, that after some slight opposition, "the prince and his minister (apparently Yekbal Khan) threw themselves on the King's mercy." On the other hand, the *Cambridge History of India*, page 365, says that "Hūshang took refuge in Schore, but the leaders convinced the king that they were loyal at heart."

<sup>4</sup> The phrase is *حرام خوارى حرامخور* in the MSS., and *حرام زادگى* in the lith. ed. In the text-edition it is *نا دولتخواهى و حرام خوارى*.

to the truth of these words." When the purport of these petitions became known to Sultān Maḥmūd, some of the Sultān's servants said that, "The object of Muḥāfiẓ Khān in making the insinuations was, that he should be able to act independently in carrying out the affairs of the state; and the turn of the *razārā* would not come to him, if Mukhtaṣ Khān and Iqbāl Khān were there. In fact, his whole energy had been devoted to this, that he might place a new face on the affairs; and having brought one of the sons of Nāṣir Shāh out of prison, he should assign the name of the Sultān to him; and should himself be the loosener and fastener (sole dictator) of all affairs."

Sultān Maḥmūd, who had no caution and foresight in his acts, ordered that when Muḥāfiẓ Khān comes to make his salute, he should be seized, and kept under guard, and should, after investigation, be punished. When the adherents of Muḥāfiẓ Khān informed him of the truth of what had happened, he appeared in the precincts of the audience hall, with his retainers, on the following day, which was the 18th Jamādī-ul-āwwal. After a little while Sultān Maḥmūd summoned him to his private chamber. He went there, and gave harsh replies to his words. Sultān Maḥmūd, in great anger and bravery, marched out with few followers from among his servants and a body of Abyssinians; and that wicked man fled out of the palace; and taking possession of the outer building raised the standard of revolt. He brought Shāhzāda Ṣāhib Khān, son of Sultān Nāṣir-ud-dīn; and besieged Maḥmūd Shāh in his palace. He was about to seize the latter, when he came out in the middle of the night, and started towards the town of Ujjain. From that place he summoned Dastūr Khān and the other *amīrs* to his presence, after giving them assurances of his favour. That very night when Sultān Maḥmūd started in his flight, Muḥāfiẓ Khān bestowed the title of <sup>1</sup> Sultān Maḥmūd on Shāhzāda Ṣāhib Khān, and placed him on the throne. After some days, Dastūr Khān arrived in Ujjain; and after him, Mukhtaṣ Khān and Iqbāl

---

<sup>1</sup> The MSS: as well as the lith. ed. say, that he received the title of Sultān Maḥmūd. It shows a lack of imagination in Muḥāfiẓ Khān that he could not give him any other title. It must have been very confusing to have the same name for both the Sultāns. Firishtah and Col. Briggs do not appear to mention the title which was given to Ṣāhib Khān. In fact he is always called Shāhzāda Ṣāhib Khān in the histories. The Cambridge History of India, page 365, says that Ṣāhib Khān was proclaimed king under the title of Maḥmūd II.

Khān joined the Sultān. Shāhzāda Šāhib Khān, on hearing this news, summoned Šadr Khān and Afḡal Khān; and he <sup>1</sup> had engagements and promises with them confirmed by very strong oaths.

On the 5th of Jamādī-ul-āwwal, he left the fort of Shadīābād in charge of <sup>2</sup> Mawadab Khān and marching to the town of Na'leha, made it his camp; and with the concurrence of Šadr Khān, ordered that a third part of the wages of the soldiers should be paid to them in cash from the treasury, to enable them to make the necessary preparations for the march to Ujjain. Sultān Maḥmūd marched from Ujjain to Dibālpūr; and after a watch of the night, the commanders, who had their families in Mandū mounted their horses, and started for the camp of Shāhzāda Šāhib Khān. The next day Sultān Maḥmūd marched from Dibālpūr in the direction of Chandēri; and writing an account of what had happened, sent it to Bihjat Khān. The latter wrote in reply, "This slave is bound to obey him, who should have the capital city of Shadīābād in his possession." Sultān Maḥmūd on receiving this reply became amazed and anxious about his future. He halted in the village of Behishtëpūr and held a consultation. Some of his adherents said, "We should take shelter in the fort of Ranthambhōr." The opinion of others was, that they should ask for help from Sultān Sikandar Lūdī. Sultān Maḥmūd declared, "It appears in my mind that we should wrap up our feet in the skirt of patience; and should wait for the rising of the stars of good fortune; it appears that it is right to take shelter in the fort of Ranthambhōr for a time, as it is imaginable that we should have help and support. It appears improper, however, on my side, to ask for help from my equals." And cutting off the chain of hope from all created things, he waited for the appearance of what was in the womb of fate.

After a few days, Mēdinī Rāy, who was distinguished by great bravery and experience, came from his *thāna* and joined him. Bihjat

<sup>1</sup> The readings are slightly different. One MS. has عهد و پيمان را بايمان غلاظ موكد گردانيد. This appears to be the best reading. The other MSS. have عهد را پيمان غلاظ موكد گردانيد. This does not appear to be correct. The lith. ed. has عهد instead of عهد, and omits the را after پيمان, in the reading in the first MS.

<sup>2</sup> The name is مودت خان in one MS. and مودنخان in the other, and مودت خان in the lith. ed. M. Hidayat Ḥosain has خردن خان in the text-edition.



Khān becoming aware of the impropriety of his (previous) acts, sent <sup>1</sup> Sharzah Khān, his son, to attend on the Sultān; and the latter, feeling that he was now more powerful, determined to march to Mandū. After some time news came that Shāhzāda Šāhib Khān was advancing towards Chandēri. When he encamped in the village <sup>2</sup> Shahrāi, the parties thought it advisable that they should arrange their troops the next morning, and await the blowing of the wind of victory and triumph. It so happened, that after the passing of one watch of the night, <sup>3</sup> Afzal Khān mounted his horse, and came to Sultān Maḥmūd's camp; and a little more than half the army, acting in concert with him, also joined Sultān Maḥmūd's camp. Shāhzāda Šāhib Khān and Muḥāfiḡ Khān, in great terror and confusion, set fire to their camp, and fled. On the 4th day they arrived in Naṣratābād, and opened the hand of lavishness for squandering the treasures, and occupied themselves with guarding and arranging the fort.

Sultān Maḥmūd performed the rites of offering thanks to God, and advanced towards Shādiābād. When he arrived in the village of <sup>4</sup> Sirsiah, the adopted son of Sultān Shihāb-ud-dīn and his *amīrs*, who had fortified themselves in the foot-hills of Bahār Bābā Ḥājī,

<sup>1</sup> The name is Sharzah Khān in both MSS. Col. Briggs calls him Shirza Khan, governor of Chandēri. The lith. ed. of the *Ṭabaqāt* has Siddai Khān and the *Cambridge History of India*, page 366, has Shiddat Khān.

<sup>2</sup> The name of the village is شہرائی and سہرائی in the MSS. and مہرائی in the lith. ed. The name does not appear in *Firishtah* or in Col. Briggs or in the *Cambridge History of India*, though they all mention the battle which took place there. M. Hidayat Ḥosain has adopted سہرائی in the text-edition.

<sup>3</sup> Neither *Firishtah* nor Col. Briggs mentions the defection of Afzal Khān from Shāhzāda Šāhib Khān's camp. The *Cambridge History of India*, page 366, mentions it, but its account differs in some particular from that in the text. In the first place, it says that the armies met in the evening. This is correct, if it means that the armies came near each other in the evening; but it certainly is not correct if it means that the armies engaged each other in the evening. Then it says, that Afzal Khān deserted, "taking half of the army with him." This is very indefinite, as it does not say half of what army he took with him. The *Ṭabaqāt* is quite definite, and I presume it is correct that he took all his own army and half of Malik's army.

<sup>4</sup> The village is called سرسیہ Sirsiah in both MSS., and سرسہ Sirsah in the lith. ed. It is not mentioned in either *Firishtah* or in Col. Briggs or in the *Cambridge History of India*.

came to Sultān Maḥmūd and obtained a promise of safety. Then by successive marches Sultān Maḥmūd encamped in the town of Sirsiaḥ; and on the next day which was the 17th of Ramaḍān in the year 917 A.H., he advanced to Shādībād, the seat of the throne, with his army in battle array. On both sides the ranks were arrayed, and the field of slaughter was arranged. Shāhzāda Ṣāhib Khān, acting with bravery, attacked<sup>2</sup> Sultān Maḥmūd's army. At this time an elephant advanced towards Sultān Maḥmūd; and he shot an arrow aiming at the breast of the *filbān* with such force, that it came out of the latter's back. At this time Mēdinī Rāy with a body of his Rājputṣ utterly routed Ṣāhib Khān's army, wounding the latter with their lances and *jamdhars* (a kind of dagger). The Shāhzāda being unable to withstand them fled; and some of his men took shelter in the fort; and<sup>3</sup> a number concealed themselves in the caverns, which are to be found in the neighbourhood of Mandū. Sultān Maḥmūd pursued them as far as the *Haud-i-Khāṣ* (special reservoir), and encamped there.

The Shāhzāda occupied himself with the defence and other arrangements of the fort; and endeavoured day and night to secure it against attack. Sultān Maḥmūd, owing to his natural kindliness sent the following message to him. "As the relation of brotherhood is between us, and the observance of the relation of kinship is one of our duties, natural morality induces me that I should bestow on you whatever place you may ask for; and you may take away as much property as you can carry away, and may go away without any objection from me. So that for no reason whatever the blood of

<sup>1</sup> The Cambridge History of India, page 366, gives November 28th (1512 ?) as the date of the battle.

<sup>2</sup> One MS. has *فراوان حمله آورد*, but the word *فراوان* does not occur in the other MS. or in the lith. ed.

<sup>3</sup> There is some difference in the readings. One MS. and the lith. ed. have *و گرومی در غارهای که در حوالی مندو واقع است مختفی شدند*, with the difference that the MS. has by mistake *از حوالی* instead of *حوالی*. The other MS. has *و در کوهها و غارهای که در حوالی مندو واقع است مختفی شدند*. The reading in the lith. ed. appears to me to be the most correct and I have accepted it. In the text-edition it is *و گرومی در غارهای که در حوالی مندو واقع است - مختفی گشتند*.

Musalmāns may not be spilled." Shāhzāda Šāhib Khān, being proud of the strength of the fort, did not agree. Sultān Maḥmūd then seized the environs of the fort, and made great efforts in carrying on the siege; till on the 16th Shawwāl of the afore-mentioned year (the troops) by the exertions and endeavours of Maulānā 'Imād-ud-dīn Khurāsānī and other brave soldiers entered the fort about the beginning of true dawn; and attacking the men in a bastion fought hand to hand with them; and in the winking of an eye mingled the blood of the followers and adherents of the Shāhzāda with the dust of wretchedness. The Shāhzāda and Muḥāfiẓ Khān taking with them a quantity of precious gems, fled by the path of the seven hundred steps; and on the 4th day joined the camp of Sultān Muẓaffar in <sup>1</sup> the town of Barōda, one of the dependencies of Gujrāt. Sultān Muẓaffar considering, the arrival of the Shāhzāda an honour, did not leave out a single minutia in the rites of hospitality. He promised that at the end of the rainy season he would take possession of the country of Mālwa, and divide it among the brothers.

From that place they went to Chāmpānir. <sup>2</sup> One day the Shāhzāda happened to go to the house of Yādgar Mughul, who was celebrated as *Surkh Kulāh* (the red cap), and had come to Gujrāt, as an ambassador from Shāh Isma'il Šafvī. There were high words among their servants, which ended in a scuffle. A report spread among the common people, that Yādgar *Surkh Kulāh* and his men had taken the Shāhzāda of Mandū as prisoner. Men belonging to the army of Gujrāt, coming in crowds, killed some of the retainers of *Surkh Kulāh*. The Shāhzāda, from shame and ignominy, turned his face towards the kingdom of Asir, without taking leave of the Sultān. He with three hundred horsemen encamped at the village of <sup>3</sup> Lōrgāon, which is distinguished as the boundary of Asir. Lōdhā the governor of the

---

<sup>1</sup> Both the MSS. have در قصبه بروده بگجرات, but the lith. ed. has در قصبه بروده از توابع گجرات. I have adopted the latter reading. M. Hidayat Hosain has در قصبه بروده بگجرات in the text-edition.

<sup>2</sup> One MS. omits the word روزی and also the word بر before منزل.

<sup>3</sup> The name of the village is written as لورگانو, probably Lōrgāon, in the MS., and as ناوگانو Naugāon in the lith. ed. It is not mentioned in either Firishtah or in Col. Briggs or in the Cambridge History of India. In the text-edition it is پور کانو.

town of Kāndūyah, having received information of this, came with great quickness and attacked him. Ṣāhib K̲h̲ān fleeing from him sought shelter with the ruler of Kāwil, which is in the Deccan. As affectionate relations existed between Sultān Maḥmūd and the ruler of Kāwil, the latter kept himself back from helping the Shāhzāda, but allotted a few villages as a contribution towards his expenses.

After that, as disturbances disappeared from the kingdom, and disorder was changed into order, Sultān Maḥmūd took his place on the dais of peace and tranquillity. Governors and *thānadārs* and revenue officers went to the different divisions and districts for the organisation of the kingdom. Mēdinī Rāy wanted to become all powerful, and to remove the *amīrs* of Ghīyāth Shāh and Nāṣir Shāh out of the way; and in pursuance of this wicked purpose he began to speak ill of the *amīrs*; and in private he slandered everyone, till one day he submitted (to the Sultān), that Afdal K̲h̲ān and Iqbāl K̲h̲ān had sent <sup>1</sup> letters to Shāhzāda Ṣāhib K̲h̲ān, and wanted to re-awaken the disturbances which had been put to sleep. Sultān Maḥmūd imagining these interested words to be disinterested, ordered, that when Afdal K̲h̲ān and Iqbāl K̲h̲ān should come to make their *salāms* they should be slain. On the following day, when they, in accordance with the usual custom, came to make their *salāms*, both of them were seized and torn joint from joint.

Sikandar K̲h̲ān, the governor of <sup>2</sup> Satwās, and Faṭḥ Jang K̲h̲ān Shērwanī, seeing this audacity and violence of Mēdinī Rāy fled and went to their *jāgīrs*. Sikandar K̲h̲ān rebelled and took possession

<sup>1</sup> The word is written as مكاتب, مكاتب, in the MSS.; and مكاتبات in the lith. ed. This last appears to me to be the best and I have retained it. In the text-edition it is مكاتب.

<sup>2</sup> The name is written as سيواس Sēwās, and اواس Awās and اسواس Aswās, and ستواس Satwās in different places in the MSS. and the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. mentions Sikandar K̲h̲ān, and his rebellion; but does not, as far as I can make out mention the name of his *jāgīr*. Col. Briggs in one place (vol. IV, p. 251) calls him "Sikundur Khan of Bhilsa"; but this is apparently a mistake, for it was Maṇṣūr K̲h̲ān, who was sent against him, and not Sikandar K̲h̲ān, who was a *jāgīrdār* of Bhilsā. The Cambridge History of India, page 366, calls Sikandar K̲h̲ān, governor of Satwās. M. Hidayat Ḥosain has adopted سواس in the text-edition.

of <sup>1</sup> the country from Kandūyah to Shahahābād, and drove out the revenue officers of the *Khālṣa*. Sultān Maḥmūd came down from the fort of Mandū, in order to put down this rebellion, on the 5th of the month of Jamādi-ul-ākhir of the year 918 A.H.; and took up his residence in the *Jahān-numā* palace at Na'lcha. He entrusted the office of the *razārāt* to Mēdinī Rāy. He sent men to Bihjat Khān, governor of Chandēri, and other *amīrs*, and summoned them. Bihjat Khān in spite of the relationship of *Khānazādī* (being a slave by descent), fearing (what Mēdinī Rāy might do to him), wrote an excuse about the near approach of the rainy season. Sultān Maḥmūd affected to overlook this; and wrote to Maṇṣūr Khān, the feudatory of Bhilsā to advance and put down Sikandar Khān. Maṇṣūr Khān collected his troops and advanced to attack Sikandar Khān; but when he arrived in the neighbourhood of the latter's country, his spies brought him the news, that Sikandar Khān had collected an immense army; and had also got the Rāys of Gōndwāna to join him. Maṇṣūr Khān halted there, reported the facts to Sultān Maḥmūd, and asked for reinforcements. Mēdinī Rāy wrote in reply, that if he was guilty of procrastination and delay in seizing Sikandar Khān, he would become liable to suffer from the chastisement of the Sultān's wrath. Maṇṣūr Khān on receiving this <sup>2</sup> order, became amazed and anxious about his future: and returned and joined Bihjat Khān. <sup>3</sup> Sanjār Khān who had been nominated to reinforce Maṇṣūr Khān also went and joined the latter.

Sultān Maḥmūd on hearing these news started from the capital, came to Dhār, and performed the pilgrimage to the tomb of Shaikh Kamāl-ud-dīn Mālwi. He then sent Mēdinī Rāy with a large army and fifty elephants, from the town of Dibālpūr, to put down Sikandar Khān; and himself went to Ujjain. Mēdinī Rāy, on arriving at

---

<sup>1</sup> Firishtah lith. ed. describes the country as *از کدومه تا قصبه شها با باد* but he does not say that Sikandar Khān took possession of it. He says that he had possession of it, *در تصرف داشت*. Col. Briggs on the contrary says, "He occupied the country lying between Kuhndwa and Shahabad"; and about the last-named place says in a footnote "probably Shahpoor". The Cambridge History of India does not mention what territory Sikandar Khān seized.

<sup>2</sup> The word is *تسکم* in one MS. and in the lith. ed., and *حکم* in the other MS.

<sup>3</sup> In text-edition it is *منجار خان* Tujjār Khān instead of *سناجار خان*.

Satwās stretched his hand for plunder and devastation; and the unalloyed pleasure of Sikandar Khān having thus become disturbed, he, in his helplessness, sought the path of peace; and through the intervention of Ḥabīb Khān came to Mēdinī Rāy. The latter went to Ujjain, and obtained the pardon of Sikandar Khān's offences. Sultān Maḥmūd drew the pen of pardon across his offences and allotted (confirmed) his rank and *jāgīr*. Sultān Maḥmūd then marched from Ujjain and came to the town of <sup>1</sup> Āgar. There a petition or report came from the *dārōgha* (superintendent) of the fort of Shādīābād to the effect, that a body of low people had risen in revolt on the night of the 25th Ramaḍān; and had raised the umbrella, which they <sup>2</sup> had brought from the tomb of Sultān Ghiyāth-ud-dīn, over the head of a man of obscure descent; and had stretched their hands to plunder the city; but that by the good fortune of His Majesty he (the *dārōgha*) had seized the head and ringleader of the mob; and the men had been punished. The Sultān sent an order containing expressions of favour and encouragement to the *dārōgha*; and himself went towards <sup>3</sup> Bahār Bābā Hāji.

From that place he sent a letter giving encouragement and promising favour to the Bihjat Khān by the hand of Bherōdās; but as his all-seeing eye was besmirched with the dust of misfortune, he sent an improper reply; and sent men to Kāwil that they might bring Shāh-zāda Ṣāhib Khān, making him their leader. He also submitted a petition to Sultān Sikandar Lūdī, to the purport, that Maḥmūd Shāh had entrusted the bridle of loosening and fastening and of defending and regulating the kingdom to the hands of *Kāfirs*; and had placed his foot of submission outside the path of the <sup>4</sup> Muṣṭafa (the chosen one, Muḥammad) to whom be the salutation; and has

<sup>1</sup> See page 570 and note 1 on the same page. The Cambridge History of India, which does not mention the town at the place referred to on page 225, mentions it here (p. 307), and calls it Āgar.

<sup>2</sup> One MS. has اورده and the other برداشته after از قبر سلطان غیاث الدین. The lith. ed. has neither the one nor the other. I have inserted اورده. In the text-edition it is برداشته.

<sup>3</sup> See page 581.

<sup>4</sup> One MS. has by mistake مصطوبه instead of مصطفویه and also has وسلم instead of السلام. The lith. ed. has و التهنئة after السلام.

made the followers of Islām wretched and miserable, and the *Kūfirs* and Rājapūts dear and honoured. <sup>1</sup> If a detachment of his victorious army should arrive in these parts, the public prayers would be read in the name of that *Bādshāh*, who is the asylum of the faith; and <sup>2</sup> his coin would be current in the country. When Bhetōdās came and reported all this, Sultān Maḥmūd collected troops, and after one week marched from <sup>3</sup> Bahūr; and encamped in the village of Shikārpūr. On the following day, he sent Mukhtas Khān with a large army to Chandēri, in advance of himself.

<sup>4</sup> About this time news came that about the middle of Muḥarram-ul-ḥarām in the year 919 A.H., Sultān Muẓaffar Gujrātī had encamped in the town of Dhār, with a large army and five hundred elephants; and was occupying himself with hunting, in the environs of the village of Dilāwarah. Although <sup>5</sup> Rāy Pithōrā and the other *amīrs*, who were in the fort of Mandū, sent a message to him, in their distress and weakness, by some trustworthy men to the effect that at this time, when Sultān Maḥmūd was engaged in attending to the administration of his kingdom, his (i.e., Sultān Muẓaffar's) intention of invading it appeared to be altogether remote from the rules of bravery and humanity. He did not at all listen to it with any idea of good will and acceptance; and sent Nizām-ul-mulk Sultānī with a large army to the neighbourhood of Na'icha. The latter arrived at the *Haṇḍ-i-Rānī*

<sup>1</sup> The facts of Bihjat Khān's sending for Shāhẓāda Šāhib Khān, and also asking Sultān Sikandar Lūdī to send an army, and promising that the public prayers would be read in his name appear to be rather inconsistent; but Firishtaḥ explains that if Sultān Sikandar Lūdī would help to place Šāhib Khān on the throne, the *Khatib* would be read in his name as the suzerain or overlord.

<sup>2</sup> There are slight differences in the readings. One MS. has *وسکۀ ایشان* and *شایع خواهد شد ایشانرا ساخت*, and the other has the same except that the words *ایشانرا* instead of *ایشان* while the lith. ed. has *سازد* *شایع*. I have adopted the first reading. In the text-edition the reading is the same except that *ایشانرا* is used in place of *ایشان* and *ساخت* instead of *شد*.

<sup>3</sup> I suppose this means Bahūr Bābā Hājī.

<sup>4</sup> The inroad of Sultān Muẓaffar is only incidentally and briefly mentioned by Firishtaḥ and Col. Briggs. The Cambridge History of India (p. 367) also mentions it, and adds that "Muẓaffar was recalled to Gujārāt by domestic disturbances."

<sup>5</sup> Son of Mēdint Rāy.

(the Rānī's reservoir or tank), but returned from there. At the time of his return, a <sup>1</sup> body of men came down from the fort and attacked him. Nizām-ul-mulk turned round and slew some of the men; and the others sought shelter in the fort. Sultān Maḥmūd on receiving this terrible news, became distressed in mind, and anxious and amazed; and did not know in what direction he should attempt first. Suddenly while he was extremely distressed, news arrived that Sultān Muẓaffar Gujrātī had turned back, and had gone back to Gujrāt by way of <sup>2</sup> Dahūd. Sultān Maḥmūd having performed the rites of offering thanks to God, placed the destruction of Bihjat K̲h̲ān in the forefront of his energy.

After some days, news came that Sikandar K̲h̲ān had again raised the standard of rebellion and a flag of violence; and had taken forcible possession of some villages belonging to the *Khālṣa* (i.e., lands in direct possession of the Sultān). Sultān Maḥmūd deputed the governor of the town of <sup>3</sup> Kandūyah named Malik Lōdhā to punish him. <sup>4</sup> Malik Lōdhā advanced towards <sup>5</sup> Satwās. After the two sides had met, the dust of disturbance and warfare continued from morning till evening. In the end Sikandar K̲h̲ān being unable to withstand him,

<sup>1</sup> One MS. has جمعی, and the other مردم. The lith. ed. has neither, or any similar word.

<sup>2</sup> دهمور in the text-edition.

<sup>3</sup> About Kandūyah see page 558 and note 6 on the same page. Firishtah has at this place حاکم کندوی و ملک بود. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 254) calls him "Mullik Lado, the governor of Kuhndwa." In another place Firishtah lith. ed. calls کند و میر, کندویه. The Cambridge History of India, page 367, does not give the name of the governor, but calls him "a loyal officer who had endeavoured to reduce him to obedience."

<sup>4</sup> The Cambridge History of India, page 367, describes the incident in a single sentence, which owing to the necessity of too much compression or from error conveys ideas which are totally different from the facts, as narrated in the *Ṭabaqāt* and by Firishtah. The sentence (a part of which I have already quoted in the preceding note) is Sikandar K̲h̲ān had defeated and slain a loyal officer who had endeavoured to reduce him to obedience. Malik Lōdhā was neither defeated nor slain by Sikandar K̲h̲ān. On the other hand he defeated Sikandar K̲h̲ān; and he was assassinated by a man probably a soldier in Sikandar K̲h̲ān's army, who had a private grudge against him.

<sup>5</sup> سیواس in the text-edition here, but سواس earlier on, see note 2, page 587.



turned his face in flight. Malik Lōdhā's troops pursued him, and were engaged in plundering. At this time, <sup>1</sup>a man whose family had been taken prisoner, came up to Malik Lōdhā, on the pretext of kissing his feet, and stabbing him in the side with a poisoned dagger destroyed the capital of his life. Sikandar Khān on hearing this <sup>2</sup>returned, and drove Malik Lōdhā's men before him; and took six elephants and many horses as booty; and returned triumphant and victorious to Satwās. When this news came to Sultān Maḥmūd, he considered the destruction of Bihjat Khān of primary importance, and advanced towards Chandēri. On the way news was brought to him, that about the middle of Dhīl-hijja'ul-ḥarām, Shāhzāda Ṣāhib Khān had arrived at Chandēri from Gōndwāna; and Bihjat Khān and Manṣūr Khān had gone forward to meet him; and had proclaimed him as the Sultān. Sultān Maḥmūd halted at the village of <sup>3</sup>Sājanpūr, and occupied himself with collecting troops.

After some days news came that <sup>4</sup>Sa'id Khān Lūdi and 'Imād-ul-mulk had encamped at a distance of five *karōhs* from Chandēri with the army of Dehli from the side of Sultān Sikandar to reinforce Ṣāhib Khān. Sultān Maḥmūd on hearing this news became extremely disheartened, and thought it advisable to <sup>5</sup>return to his own place (i.e., I suppose Mandū). On the way, he summoned the *amīrs* to his presence; and got them to strengthen their promises and engagements by oaths. But in spite of their oaths and the renewal of their engagements, when a part of the night had passed, Ṣadr Khān and <sup>6</sup>Mukhtaṣ Khān, who were <sup>7</sup>truthful *amīrs*, fled towards Chandēri. Maḥmūd Shāh sent a body of men in pursuit; and himself encamped

<sup>1</sup> Firishtah describes him as *از لشکریان مکندر خان که عیالش امیر شده بود* i.e., one of Sikandar Khān's soldiers whose family had been made prisoner.

<sup>2</sup> One MS. omits by mistake the words from *لودھا* *بستواس* to *مردم ملک* *برگشت*.

<sup>3</sup> The name is Sājanpūr and Sājan in the MSS., and Sijanpūr in the lith. ed. It is not mentioned by Firishtah or Col. Briggs or in the Cambridge History of India. The latter says in the corresponding passage that Maḥmūd "retired to Bhilsa and remained for some time in that neighbourhood."

<sup>4</sup> One MS. omits Khān after Sa'id.

<sup>5</sup> One MS. has by mistake *مقاومت* instead of *معاودت*.

<sup>6</sup> One MS. has *دیگران* instead of *مختص خان*, Mukhtaṣ Khān.

<sup>7</sup> The epithet truthful is probably used ironically.



and *Dinārs* would be struck and <sup>1</sup>imprinted with the name of that sovereign; but up to the present day no sign of these things has shown itself." As they <sup>2</sup>did not get a reply such as they wanted, they marched from the village of Shahrāī, and halted at a place fourteen *karōhs* further back. From that place they sent a report of what had happened. Sultān Sikandar sent a *farmān* recalling them. When Sultān Sikandar's army, annoyed at what had happened, went towards Delhī, Sultān Maḥmūd being expectant of receiving the grace of God, planned a hunting excursion. At this time, one day in the course of the hunting a spy submitted a report, that Khwājah Jahān and Muḥāfiẓ Khān had marched away towards Shādīābād with a large army. Sultān Maḥmūd returned from the place where he received the report; and deputed Ḥabīb Khān and Fakhr-ul-mulk and <sup>3</sup>Hēmkanan to put down and crush Muḥāfiẓ Khān. Ḥabīb Khān and the other *amīrs* arrived at Na'leha on the 16th Rabī'ul-thānī. It so happened that Muḥāfiẓ Khān had arrived there three or four hours before them; and a battle having taken place, he, owing to the ill luck which always follows a rebel, was killed; and his head having been cut off, they returned with victory and triumph to their own camp. Shāhzāda Ṣāhib Khān, on hearing this news was full of grief and sorrow; and shut the door of the entrance and exit of the Khāns before his face.

Bihjat Khān and Ṣadr Khān thought it advisable, that with the intervention of the learned men and Shaikhs, they should ask for the pardon of their own offences, and should pray for one out of the

<sup>1</sup> One MS. and the lith. ed. have ملوک instead of مسکوک, which is the correct word.

<sup>2</sup> One MS. has by mistake نه نوشتند instead of نشنیدند. Firishtah explains that public prayers were read in Sultān Sikandar's name in Chandēri, but as about forty thousand Rājputs had assembled in Sultān Maḥmūd's army, Sultān Sikandar recalled the force which he had sent, and which, according to Firishtah, consisted of twelve thousand horsemen.

<sup>3</sup> The name is written with slight variation in the MSS. and in the lith ed., but looks like Hamikaran. Firishtah lith. ed. gives the name of Ḥabīb Khān and Fakhr-ul-mulk, and adds many of the Rājput *amīrs*. Hamikaran or Hēmkanan was apparently one of them. Col. Briggs mentions the name of "Hubeeb Khan" alone. The Cambridge History of India, page 367, says briefly "an attempt of Muḥāfiẓ Khān to return to Māndū was defeated." ممیکرن in the text-edition.

many districts of the kingdom for Shāhzāda (Ṣāhib Kḥān). They then went together to Ṣāhib Kḥān and submitted these proposals to him. He said, "This has been recurring to my mind for a long time. I have been sorrowful and unhappy at the coming of Sultān Maḥmūd's army; but praise be to God! that this danger has passed away." Bihjat Kḥān then, with the advice of the *amīrs*, sent Shaikh Aūliyā to the Sultān's camp; and prayed for the pardon of their offences; and asked for a place to help in the expenses of the Shāhzāda. <sup>1</sup> Sultān Maḥmūd, considering this to be one of the supernatural mercies and indubitable blessings, made over the fort of Rāisin and the villages of Bhīlsā and Dhamōnī to the Shāhzāda; and gave him for his immediate expenses <sup>2</sup> ten *lakhs* of *tankas* and also twelve elephants, and sent *farmāns* promising favour to Bihjat Kḥān and <sup>3</sup> the other *amīrs* and Kḥāns. He then gave permission to the emissaries of Bihjat Kḥān to return; and sent a body of his own servants with them. When Shaikh Aūliyā and the other emissaries arrived in the neighbourhood of Chandērī, Bihjat Kḥān sent his son Sharzah Kḥān to welcome them; and met them on their arrival with honour and respect. When he learned the purport of the *farmāns*, he sent the *farmān* for the government of Rāisin and Bhīlsā to Ṣāhib Kḥān by the hand of Sharzah Kḥān; but kept the ten *lakhs* of *tankas* in cash and the twelve elephants with himself. Some strife-mongers said to Shāhzāda Ṣāhib Kḥān, that Bihjat Kḥān had determined that on the morning of the 'Īd-i-*fiṭr* (the 'Īd of the breaking of the fast) he would seize him and some of his immediate adherents in the *Nimāzgāh*; and <sup>4</sup> he had accordingly sent Shaikh

<sup>1</sup> One MS. omits Maḥmūd after Sultān.

<sup>2</sup> Firishtah lith. ed. has تنگہ سبلا, and Col. Briggs has copper tangas. The Cambridge History of India, page 367, has, a substantial amount without further definition.

<sup>3</sup> There are slight variations in the readings. The reading I have adopted is that in the lith. ed. One MS. omits امرأ, and the other has خوانین و امرا.

<sup>4</sup> The meaning is not clear. On the whole it appears that Bihjat Kḥān did all this, but why he should have strengthened the engagement with Shaikh Aūliyā or should have sent for some troops is not very clear, if he was arranging matters secretly to secure Ṣāhib Kḥān on the day of the 'Īd. Firishtah does not make matters clearer, as he says that Ṣāhib Kḥān betook himself to Sultān Sikandar Lūdi immediately on hearing that Bihjat Kḥān wanted to make him a prisoner. Col. Briggs does not refer to the matter at all. The Cambridge History of India, page 367, says that "The retention of the money by Bihjat

Aūliyā to the camp, and had strengthened the promises and engagements with oaths; and had sent for a body of troops. On hearing this news, a great fear and terror came on the Shāhzāda; and he spent all day in thought and anxiety; and on the night of the 9th Ramaḍān, he without thinking of his ultimate fate chose to tread an unknown path; and betook himself to Sultān Sikandar's army, which was on the frontier (of Mālwa). When this news reached Maḥmūd Shāh, he on the 19th Shawwāl came to Chandēri. <sup>1</sup> Bihjat Khān, and the great men of the city hastened to welcome him, and made their excuses. Maḥmūd Shāh drew the line of pardon across the page of their offences and distinguished each one of them by conferring robes of honour and by giving rewards. He stayed there for some days, and having arranged the affairs of that neighbourhood went back to the capital city of Shādiābād.

Then at the wicked instigation and by the evil counsel of Mēdīnī Rāy he struck the merciless sword at the *amīrs* and *sardārs*; and making each of them suspected and accused of offences not committed by them brought them into the place of punishment. Gradually things came to such a pass, that the disposition of Maḥmūd Shāh turned from all the *amīrs*, and in fact from all Musalmāns. He placed the mark of dismissal on the forehead of the old officers who had formed a faithful band, and had been entrusted for years, under the government of Ghiyāth Shāh and Nāṣir Shāh, with all matters of revenue; and appointed the helpers and confederates of Mēdīnī Rāy in their places. Owing to these acts, most of the *amīrs*, *sardārs* and public servants became broken hearted, and holding the hands of their relatives and families chose to exile themselves from their country. The fort of Shādiābād, which had at one time been the home of learning and contained men of wisdom, and Shaikhhs, became the residence of <sup>2</sup> *Kāfirs*. Things finally assumed such a shape, that all offices and

Khān excited the apprehensions of Muhammad, who believed that he was about to be betrayed to his brother."

<sup>1</sup> I suppose that the Sultān and they all considered that the flight of Ṣāhib Khān had offered them a very easy way out of many difficulties.

<sup>2</sup> The word is written as کواران in the MSS. and کوران in the lith. ed. I cannot find any meaning of کور or کور that would suit the context. The nearest meaning of کور is a class of gipsies in India, and of کور the blind. In

ports in the government of Maḥmūd Shāh, even down to those of a *darbān* (door-keeper) or *ḥilbān*, (elephant-keeper) were given by Mēdinī Rāy to his own agents. There did not remain in the service of Sultān Maḥmūd more than two hundred men belonging to the class of Musalmāns. And <sup>1</sup>even Musalmān and Saiyid women <sup>2</sup>were taken by the Rājput̃s, and were turned into slave girls. They were taught the art of dancing, and were made to join the *akhāras* (dancing clubs). They even took possession of the singing women of Sultān Nāṣir-ud-dīn.

Sultān Maḥmūd although he saw the power and violence of the Rājput̃s was powerless. And as the custom among the people of Hindūstān is, that when they send away one of their servants, or bid adieu to a guest, they give him *p̃n* (beetle leaf), Sultān Maḥmūd sent a vessel filled with *p̃n* made into packages for chewing to Mēdinī Rāy by the hand of Ārāish Khān; and gave him a message, that after that he had permission to leave (the Sultān's service); and he should go out of his (the Sultān's) kingdom. The Rājput̃s replied, "We forty thousand horsemen have up to this day performed loyal and devoted service; and have never committed any fault. We have done praiseworthy service. We do not know what fault has been committed by us." When Ārāish Khān took this reply, the Rājput̃s assembled in the house of Mēdinī Rāy, and determined that they should remove the Sultān; and place Rāy Rāyān, the son of Mēdinī Rāy, on the throne. Mēdinī Rāy said, "At the present moment the

---

the corresponding passage in *Firishtah*, the word is کافران, which is all right and I have taken it. M. Hidayat Ḥosain has adopted گواران or gipsies in the text-edition.

<sup>1</sup> *Firishtah* lith. ed. says that 'Alī Khān, one of the old *amīrs*, who was the governor of the city was exasperated by the domination and violence of the Rājput̃s, and he assisted by the people of the city took possession of the fort when Sultān Maḥmūd had gone on a hunting excursion attended by his Rājput̃ servants. When they returned they besieged the fort, and 'Alī Khān had to evacuate it. He was pursued and was seized and executed. This is mentioned also in Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 256), but he changes the name of 'Alī Khān to Ghalib Khan. The Cambridge History of India does not mention these incidents.

<sup>2</sup> One MS. has شدند in place of شده, and then leaving out the following words as far as استیلاى راجپوتان, substitutes for them ديدۀ امرواى سلطان محمود ابن امير ديدۀ امرواى راجپوتان, بي طاقت شد.

*salṭanat* of Mālwa is in reality in our possession. If, however, Maḥmūd Shāh does not remain as a buffer, Sultān Muẓaffar Gūjrātī will come galloping along and will seize the kingdom. Therefore we should, in every way that may be possible, endeavour to please our master."

Then Mēdinī Rāy with other Rājput̃s waited on the Sultān, and standing in the place of those who prayed for pardon submitted, "It is not <sup>1</sup> concealed from your world-adorning wisdom, that from us (who are your) slaves, nothing <sup>2</sup> but loyalty and service has been shown. By the grace of God we slew with great torment Muḥāfiẓ Khān, who was a great enemy of the Sultān. Although man is steeped from head to foot with sins and offences, still no offence has been committed by us, which might throw dust over, and cause pain to Your Majesty's gracious mind; and even supposing that owing to human frailty a harsh deed should have been perpetuated by us, we hope that, with your innate generosity and natural inclination to forgive, you will grant us pardon for it; and after this, nothing will be done by us that would be contrary to your wishes and pleasure." Sultān Maḥmūd whether willingly or otherwise acted with politeness, and abandoned the idea of a conflict on this <sup>3</sup> condition, that he would make over all the posts in the different offices, according to previous custom, to the old Musalmān officers; that Mēdinī Rāy would not give his men any right of interfering in the affairs of state, and they should send out Musalmān women from their houses; and should shorten the arm of oppression. Mēdinī Rāy owing to the exigencies of the time accepted the conditions; and tried hard to please the Sultān. But <sup>4</sup> Sūlbāhan, who was the *vazīr*, refused to obey, and refused to give up his wicked acts and evil practices.

<sup>1</sup> One MS. has *مختفی* while the other and the lith. ed. have *مخفی*.

<sup>2</sup> Both MSS. have *بعد*, but the lith. ed. has *بغير*.

<sup>3</sup> The same conditions are mentioned by Firishtah, lith. ed., but the word *مالی* is inserted after *ملکی* in it. Col. Briggs mentions them also with some variations. The Cambridge History of India (p. 368) mentions only one condition, *viz.*, that about the keeping of Muslim women by Rājput̃s as concubines, which it describes as the greatest offence in the eyes of the Muslims.

<sup>4</sup> The correct transliteration of the name as in the text is Sūlbāhan; but the correct translation of the Sanskrit name is Sālibāhana. Col. Briggs transliterates the name as Salb'han, but in a note has Salivahan. The Cambridge History of India, page 368, has Sālibāhan. In the text-edition it reads

Sultān, Maḥmūd with great bravery, in spite of the fact that he had not more than two hundred Musalmāns in his service, determined in consultation with some of his special adherents, that when he should<sup>1</sup> return from hunting, and Mēdinī Rāy and Sālbāhan should receive permission to go to their houses, they (*i.e.*, those adherents) should, at the time of their returning, cut them to pieces. The next day he went out hunting, leaving the men, who had been chosen for the work, at their places. Returning from the hunting, he went into his private chamber and gave permission to Mēdinī Rāy and Sālbāhan to go home. At this time those men came out of ambush, and wounded Mēdinī Rāy and Sālbāhan. The last named was killed on the spot; but as Mēdinī Rāy's wounds were not fatal, he was carried to his house. The Rājput̃s on hearing this news, prepared themselves and collected in Mēdinī Rāy's house with the object of causing an injury to Sultān Maḥmūd. The latter, on hearing this, with very great bravery and courage came out of the palace with only 16 Musalmān horsemen and a few foot soldiers in order, so to say, to suffer martyrdom; and prepared to fight. Some thousands of Rājput̃s came forward and commenced an attack. One of the *Pūrabiya* Rājput̃s, who was noted for his bravery, placed his foot firmly on the battlefield, and threw a weapon at the Sultān. The latter carried it and cut the assailant asunder. Another Rājput̃ threw his javelin at the Sultān. The latter caught it on his sword; and cut him into two from his

---

اما سالباهن پوريه سراز انقياد پيچيده and there is no mention of who was the *vaṭir*.

<sup>1</sup> Firishtah and Col. Briggs agree generally with the text, as to the attack on Mēdinī Rāy and Sālbāhan, the subsequent attack by the Rājput̃s on the palace, and the Sultān's great bravery in repelling it. It appears, however, that the first attack on the palace was made without consulting or asking the permission of Mēdinī Rāy. They also say that although the Sultān was deficient in intelligence, he had no equal in bravery; and also that when the Rājput̃s asked for Mēdinī Rāy's permission to make a second attack, (Col. Briggs says, they asked him to head it) he told them to desist from it. The Cambridge History of India, page 368, says, that the Rājput̃s "were defeated, chiefly owing to their fear of provoking the intervention of Muẓaffar II of Gujārāt." This is certainly not correct. The Rājput̃s were defeated in a fair fight, although the odds were very much in their favour. They were, however, forbidden by Mēdinī Rāy from making a second attack, for fear chiefly of provoking the intervention of Sultān Muẓaffar of Gujārāt, which is very different.



waist. The Rājput̃s on seeing this fled, and collected together, and wanted to advance in a great crowd to slay the Sultān.

When Mēdinī Rāy became acquainted with this resolution, he said, "Maḥmūd Shāh is my benefactor, if his men wounded me by his order, what business is it of yours? If the shadow of his greatness be not over our head, Sultān Muẓaffar Gujrātī would completely destroy us." The Rājput̃s went back to their houses at the word of Mēdinī Rāy, and the tumult subsided. That night Mēdinī Rāy sent a humble message to the Sultān saying, "As during the whole of my life I have never done anything but wish for your welfare, and act faithfully to my salt, I have carried my life in safety from the wounds. If in reality, the affairs of the kingdom can be better regulated by my being put to death, I have no objection even to that." Maḥmūd Shāh said, "I have arrived at the conclusion, that Mēdinī Rāy is a loyal servant of mine. Owing to his great devotion to me, he kept the infuriated Rājput̃s back yesterday from creating disorder and disturbance. I shall heal his wounded heart with the ointment of favour and graciousness."

After some days, when <sup>1</sup> Mēdinī Rāy's wounds had healed, he came with five hundred armed horsemen to make his *salām*; and thenceforward he came every day in the same way to make his *salām*. Maḥmūd Shāh, on account of his great courage and bravery, treated him in the same way as before, and reassuring him sent him to the office, so that he might attend to the affairs of state. When a considerable time elapsed with the Sultān acting with gentleness and courtesy; and he saw that there was nothing left to him of rule except the name, he in the months of the year 920 A.H., came out of the fort of Mandū on the pretext of going out hunting. He took with him <sup>2</sup> Rānī Kaniyā, who was the most beloved of his harem, <sup>3</sup> and the large body

<sup>1</sup> There are variations in the readings. One MS. has زخم او مذمل گرد the other has زخم او میدنی رای in place of او. The lith. ed. has a different reading زخم او. تبدیل بصحت کرد. In the text-edition it is مزمل گردید.

<sup>2</sup> The name is written in the MSS. as رانی کنیا and رانی کهارا in the lith. ed. See, however, note 2, page 302, from which it appears that she was called Rānī Kanākrā in the Mirāt-i-Sikandari.

<sup>3</sup> The sentence is left incomplete in the MSS., as well as in the lith. ed. In the corresponding passage, Firishtah has به بهانه شکار راجپوتانرا تردد بسیار فرموده



of the two luminaries took place in one *majlis* and on one throne, Sultān Muẓaffar observing the customs of generosity and the rites of liberality made wise inquiries and presenting royal gifts placed (soothing) ointment on his wounded (spirit).

After some days, <sup>1</sup> Sultān Muẓaffar advanced into the country of Mālwa with a well-equipped army; and when he arrived near Dhār, Rāy Pithōrā strengthened the fort of Mandū, and busied himself with measures of guarding it. Mēdinī Rāy and Silhadī went to Chitōr with some thousands of Rājputs, and sought the protection of Rānā Sānkā. Sultān Muẓaffar besieged the fort of Mandū, and distributed the batteries. After some days Rāy Pithōrā approached him with humility, and after asking for safety prayed for fourteen *parganas* for his own *jāgīr*. Sultān Muẓaffar in his great kindness granted his prayer. On the following day Pithōrā again sent a message saying, "As we have committed many evil deeds, and fear and alarm have come upon us, if you would retire with your army for a distance of three *karōhs*, we would take hold of the hands of our wives and children, come down from the fort, and surrender it to anyone whom you may order." Sultān Muẓaffar accepted the prayer of that deceitful band, and took up a position three *karōhs* behind his former station. Then it became clear, that Rāy Pithōrā was merely wasting time, and waiting for the arrival of <sup>2</sup> Mēdinī Rāy and Rānā Sānkā.

The Sultān then, acting with hostility and violence, returned (to his former camp); and surrounded the fort like the centre of a circle. At this time news was brought that Mēdinī Rāy and Silhadī had given large sums to Rānā Sānkā, and promising him more were bringing him with all the *zamīndārs* of the neighbourhood to aid and reinforce them, and they had arrived near the city of Ujjain. Sultān Muẓaffar sent Ā'zam Humāyūn 'Ādil Khān, the ruler of Asir and Burhānpūr, who was his nephew (sister's son) and son-in-law, and Fath Khān and Qawām-ul-mulk to chastise and punish Mēdinī Rāy

<sup>1</sup> Nizām-ud-din does not say what Mēdinī Rāy did to meet Sultān Muẓaffar, Firishtah and Col. Briggs do so in some detail. For another account of the siege and capture of Mandū as given in the history of the reign of Sultān Muẓaffar in the section of the *Tabaqāt* about Gujrāt, see pages 303, 304.

<sup>2</sup> In the text-edition it is رانا سانکا و مېدنی راي instead of Mēdinī Rāy and Rānā Sānkā.



When this news reached Rāy Pithōrā, he sent Shādī Khān *Pūrabīya* with five hundred Rājput̃s, in advance of himself, to put down 'Imād-ul-mulk. He himself followed Shādī Khān with some thousands of Rājput̃s. The Gujrāt warriors coming within bow-shot pierced the men who were coming along in front of Shādī Khān with their arrows; and they on receiving those life-scorching wounds fled like wounded pigs. About this time Sultān Muẓaffar Gujrātī entered the fort by the same route. When the eyes of the garrison fell on Sultān Muẓaffar's standard, they returned to their houses and performed *jauhar*. (This is) a practice of the Rājput̃s, that in times of discomfiture and distress, they set fire to their houses, and put their wives and children to death, and burn themselves. They call this practice *jauhar*. Hosts and crowds of Gujrātī warriors entered the houses and residences and committed a general massacre. It has been correctly ascertained, that during that night and a part of the following day nineteen thousand Rājput̃s were slain; and so much booty and so many prisoners fell into the hands of the army of Gujrāt, that the <sup>1</sup>accountant of the age confessed his weakness and failure in computing them.

When with the strength of Divine help, the victory was attained; and the Rājput̃s, who had been unfaithful to their salt, had received their reward, Sultān Maḥmūd came, and offering his congratulations, asked quickly, "What does the lord of the world order me?". Sultān Muẓaffar, in his <sup>2</sup>greatness said, "May the rule of Mālwa be of good omen to you." He left Sultān Maḥmūd in the fort of Shādīābad, and returned immediately to his camp. On the following day he raised the standard of departure from that station towards Ujjain with the object of punishing Rānā Sānkā. When he arrived at the fort of Dhār, they brought him the news, that 'Ādil Khān and the *amīrs* had not yet gone beyond the town of Dībālpūr Banhariya, when Rānā Sānkā, on hearing the capture of the fort, had fled and gone to his own country; and had traversed a distance of twenty-seven *karōhs*, taking Mēdinī Rāy and Silhadi with him. Sultān Muẓaffar, on hearing this news, carried out the practice of praising, and offering

---

<sup>1</sup> A figurative way of saying that the booty and prisoners were beyond computation. One MS. has by mistake روزگار instead of روزگار.

<sup>2</sup> One MS. has by mistake بزرگی instead of بزرگی .

thanks to God; and summoned 'Ādil Khān and the *amīrs*. Sultān Mahmūd waited on Sultān Muẓaffar at this station, and submitted; "If your Majesty would go to the fort of Shādiābād, and would exalt me by remaining there for one day :

Couplet;

On that side, your greatness would suffer no less,

On this side it would give me nobility great."

Sultān Muẓaffar left his camp at Dhār, and went himself to the fort of Shādiābād. Sultān Mahmūd carried out all the duties of hospitality, and offered suitable tribute. After the *maǧlis* and the entertainments were over, Sultān Muẓaffar went over the buildings and the gardens and then went back to his camp. From there, accompanied by victory and triumph, he started on his journey to Gujrāt.

Sultān Mahmūd, on account of his great affection and devotion, attended on him for some stages. Sultān Muẓaffar then bade him farewell, and left Āṣaf Khān Gujrātī with some thousand horsemen to help and reinforce him; and asked to be excused. Sultān Mahmūd taking up his abode in the fort of Shādiābād, in concert with Āṣaf Khān, sent letters of encouragement and favour to the *amīrs*, *soldārs* and his own soldiers and summoned them. The *amīrs* and his own servants came to Mandū from the various places where they resided with happy and joyful steps; and when his army assembled round him, he, with the advice and concurrence of Āṣaf Khān, advanced to attack Hēmkaran, who had fortified himself in the fort of Kākṛūn, on behalf of Mēdini Rāy. On becoming aware of

<sup>1</sup> The words in one MS. are *برسم متابعت همراہ رفت*. In the other MS. a word which looks like *مشایعہ* is written in place of *متابعت*; the word is clearly *مشایعہ* in the lith. eds. of the *Ṭabaqāt* and of *Firishtah*. *مشایعہ* means willing, wishing, desiring. I consider *متابعت* the best reading, and have adopted it. In the text-edition *مشایعہ* has been adopted.

<sup>2</sup> The words are *عذر خواست* in the MSS., and *بدر خواست* in the lith. ed. There are no corresponding words in the lith. ed. of *Firishtah*. I do not know what reason there was for Sultān Muẓaffar for asking to be excused. I suppose it was a mere matter of courtesy.

<sup>3</sup> He was called Bihm Kuran in the Gujrāt section of the *Ṭabaqāt*, *vide* page 307 and note 1 on the same page. M. Hidayat Ḥosain has *بیمرگن* in the text-edition.

this, Mēdinī Rāy said to Rānā Sānkā, "All that I have, is in the fort of Kākrūn. I came to you, praying for your help, with the object that you would deliver over the country of Mālwa to me, after thoroughly purifying it. But now things have come to this <sup>1</sup>pass, that they are taking away from me whatever I have." The <sup>2</sup>daring and boorishness of Rānā Sānkā having come into motion, he came out of the fort of Chitōr with some thousands of blood-thirsty Rājputs, and advanced towards Kākrūn. When this news reached Sultān Maḥmūd, he owing to his great courage and bravery, abandoned the path of prudence and caution, and raising the siege of Kākrūn, advanced to meet Rānā Sānkā in battle. He marched most of the days, and it so happened that on the day on which the battle was to take place, he had traversed a very long distance, and had halted at a distance of seven *karōhs* from Rānā Sānkā. When this news reached the latter, he sent for his *amīrs*, and said, "It is best that we should attack the enemy at this very moment, for they have come a long way and have no strength to move or exert themselves. If we advance fast and quickly, they will have no time to <sup>3</sup>array their troops; and our work would be done with ease." All the Rāys and Rājputs praised and attested to the correctness of this declaration; and they mounted and advanced with their troops in good order.

When they arrived near Sultān Maḥmūd's camp, <sup>4</sup>the troops of the latter came one by one or two by two (i.e., in very small bands) into the battle, in the way which Rānā Sānkā had predicted; and were immediately made martyrs. Because they fought without being properly marshalled, thirty-two *sardārs* among the old and

<sup>1</sup> One MS. has کاری رسیدہ while the other has کار بجای رسیدہ. I have retained the reading in the lith. ed. which is کار بجای رسیدہ.

<sup>2</sup> The words in the MSS. are جمیت و جاملیت. The words in the lith. ed. are عرق جمعیت. جمیت is of course incorrect.

<sup>3</sup> Both MSS. have فوج راست کردن. I have adopted this, though the فوج ارامتن of the lith. ed. is equally good, if not better.

<sup>4</sup> Firishah lith. ed. says, that Āṣaf Khān and the other *amīrs* said, that they should not engage the enemy that day, but Sultān Maḥmūd Khālji, i.e., who was destitute of intelligence, did not accept their advice.

trusted men became martyrs; and of the Gujrāt army, <sup>1</sup> Āṣaf Khān and five hundred horsemen drank the *sharbat* of martyrdom; and a great defeat fell on Sultān Maḥmūd's army. The latter, however, who was extremely brave and courageous, stood in the field of chivalry with two or three horsemen; and when the Rājput troops advanced against him, he galloped on his gray horse, which was as swift as the wind and the lightning; and dived into the Rājput army, which was like a sea of swords and spears. He received a hundred and more wounds on his armour; and as he wore two suits of armour, fifty of those wounds passed through the inner armour and reached his body. In spite of his having received so many wounds, he did not turn his face from the enemy. When he fell off the back of his horse on the ground <sup>2</sup> the Rājputs recognised him, and carried him to Rānā Sānkā. Every one of them poured forth their praises and eulogies; and offered to sacrifice themselves in his honour. Rānā Sānkā stood before him, with his arms crossed on his breast, and carried out the duties of service and attendance, and arranged for the treatment of his wounds. When the Sultān regained his health, Rānā <sup>3</sup> Sānkā prayed that he should be exalted by the Sultān by bestowing his crown on him. Sultān Maḥmūd made over the crown, decorated with pearls and other precious stones (*Yawāqūt*, which means both rubies and sapphires). <sup>4</sup> Rānā Sānkā then sent ten thousand Rājput horsemen with him, and sent him to Mandū; and himself went back to Chitōr.

---

<sup>1</sup> It may be noted that in the section about Gujrāt, it was the son of Āṣaf Khān, and not Āṣaf Khān himself who was said to have been slain, *vide* page 307. In the corresponding passage here, Firishtah agrees with the Ṭabaqāt that Āṣaf Khān with five hundred Gujrātī horsemen was slain, but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 263) says, as in the Guzerat section, that "Asuf Khan's son and almost the whole of the Guzeratties were killed."

<sup>2</sup> Firishtah also says that the Rājputs recognised him, but one would have thought that, as he had fought with such bravery he would be the cynosure of all eyes, and there would be no necessity or difficulty for recognising him.

<sup>3</sup> This appears to be a rather extraordinary prayer, but Firishtah says that as on the day of the battle, all Sultān Maḥmūd's baggage had fallen into the hands of Rānā Sānkā and of the Rājputs, and they did not find Sultān Hūshang's *تاج مرصع* among the other articles, he asked for it, and Sultān Maḥmūd got it and gave it to him. The Cambridge History of India, page 369, says the Rānā compelled Maḥmūd "to surrender all his crown jewels."

<sup>4</sup> Both the MSS. and the lith. ed. say that Sultān Maḥmūd was sent to Mandū with an escort of ten thousand horsemen; but Firishtah lith. ed. and



<sup>1</sup> It will not remain concealed from the minds of intelligent men, that Rānā Sānkā's act was on a higher level than that of Sultān Muẓaffar. The latter gave help to one who had sought shelter with him; but Rānā Sānkā having captured an enemy in battle gave him back his kingdom. No act similar to this wonderful one is known up to the present day. In short, on hearing this news, Sultān Muẓaffar sent a large force to reinforce Sultān Maḥmūd; and sending an affectionate letter applied ointment to the wounds of his heart; and showed great kindness towards him. The Gujrāt troops remained in Mālwa for a long time; but after the rule of Sultān Maḥmūd had acquired a certain amount of strength, the latter sent a letter to Sultān Muẓaffar, in which he renewed his protestations of gratitude; and prayed that, as his government had assumed a desirable aspect, Sultān Muẓaffar should recall his troops. The latter did so; but after the departure of the Gujrāt army, Sultān Maḥmūd's weakness became evident and patent. He was bereft of nearly the whole of his territory. Rānā Sānkā seized a portion with violence and tyranny; and Silhadi *Pūrabiya* brought the country from the boundary of Sārangpūr as far as Bhilsā and Rāisin under his control, and became independent. Sikandar Khān was in possession in the neighbourhood of <sup>2</sup> Satwās and its dependencies. So that of the kingdom of Mālwa only a tenth part remained in the possession of Sultān Maḥmūd; and he remained with

Col. Briggs reduce the number of the escort to one thousand horsemen; and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 263, footnote) says (without giving any authority for making this statement), that Sooltan Mahmood was conveyed in the first instance to Chittoor, where the place of his confinement is still shown; but he was released on recovery from his wounds. In the same note Col. Briggs contrasts the chivalrous conducts of Hindoo princes, "in their behaviour to Mahomedans in general, with the sordid, cruel, and bigotted conduct of the latter" to the Hindoos. This is correct; but I do not know whether the story of Sultān Maḥmūd being taken to Chitōr, like the other story of Rānā Kōnbhā's defeating Maḥmūd of Gujrāt and Maḥmūd of Mālwa, and keeping the latter as a prisoner at Chitōr, has any foundation in fact.

<sup>1</sup> Nizām-ud-dīn shows himself superior to all communal prejudice by this eulogy on Rānā Sānkā's conduct; but it appears to me that the latter rather marred his proceedings by demanding the surrender of the Mālwa Crown Jewels.

<sup>2</sup> The name is written *سراس* and *موراس* in the MSS., and *میواس* in the lith. ed.; but we have already found that the *jāgīr* of Sikandar Khān was Satwās.

twenty thousand horsemen in Jāwar. Although Rānā Sānkā possessed the power of taking possession of the entire country of Mālwa, still having the fear of Sultān Muẓaffar before his eyes he restrained himself, (*ḡarḡizah 'ayn būd*, which may literally be translated as: he kept a tight hold on his bridle).

It so happened that at this time, when Sultān Muẓaffar passed away, and the enemy (of Sultān Mahmūd) acquired power and strength, the violence of Silhadi extended beyond all measure. So in the year 926 A.H. (1519 A.D.), Sultān Mahmūd having collected 7 an army, advanced towards the country of Bhilsā. <sup>2</sup> Silhadi marched to the neighbourhood of Sīrangpūr, and fought with him. Sultān Mahmūd's army was routed, but he himself stood firmly in the field of bravery with twenty horsemen, and coming within bow-shot fought with the greatest courage and boldness till some of the renowned warriors in Silhadi's army fell on the dust of destruction at his hands; and things came to such a pass that Silhadi escaped by flight. Sultān Mahmūd pursued him for a part of the way, and separating (seizing) twenty-four elephants returned to Mandū. After that Silhadi came forward in a spirit of submission and friendliness, expressed his contritions, and sending some beautiful things and presents in the way of a tribute, asked for <sup>4</sup> pardon for his past conduct.

And during the year 932 A.H., 1525 A.D., Sultān Muẓaffar accepted the summons of the just God, and the business of the

<sup>1</sup> The name is Jāwar in the MSS., and Khāwar in the lith. ed. I have not found it mentioned anywhere else. The Cambridge History of India, page 369, says that Mahmūd's authority now extended only to the neighbourhood of the capital. M. Hidayat Husain has چاوار in the text-edition.

<sup>2</sup> One MS. has ما لشكرى instead of لشكر.

<sup>3</sup> Firsihah's and Col. Briggs's (vol. IV, p. 264) accounts agree generally with the text; but they say that Sultān Mahmūd rallied the few men who were with him, when Silhadi's troops were engaged in plundering, and after defeating the latter pursued them to Sīrangpūr, and took possession of it, together with twenty-four elephants. Silhadi made no attempt to recover Sīrangpūr and remained content with Bhilsā and Rālsin.

<sup>4</sup> The word is written as استغفار and استغلى in the MS., and استغفار in the lith. ed. I have retained the reading in the lith. ed. In the text-edition it is استغفاد.

<sup>1</sup> The Cambridge History of India, page 369, describes Sultān Mahmūd's conduct as characterised by incomprehensible folly and ingratitude. I cannot agree to the charge of ingratitude. He had reasons to be grateful to Sultān Muẓaffar, but he could not refuse to give an asylum to Chānd Khān without being accused of ingratitude. He should, however, have accepted Sultān Bahādur's accession, and should not have allowed Raḍī-ul-mulk to come to Mandū and intrigue against Sultān Bahādur; but by all accounts he was as weak mentally as he was brave in battle.

<sup>2</sup> One MS. has by mistake Humāyūn Bād-shāh.

<sup>3</sup> There are various slight differences in the readings, and the meaning is not quite clear; but the reading and the translation I have adopted appear to be correct.



separated from the latter and entered his service. In the town of Dhār, Sharzah Khān, who was a great *sardār*, also came and joined him, and when he arrived at the town of Na'leha, he besieged the fort and distributed the batteries, and himself took up his residence in Muḥammadpūr. Sultān Maḥmūd fortified himself in the fort of Mandū with three thousand men, and every night he went over to inspect all the bastions, and then took his rest in the college of Sultān Ghiyāth-ud-dīn. But when he came to know that the men in the fort were hostile to him, and had obtained promises from Sultān Bahādur, he moved from the college and came to his palace. He then arranged things for a festive gathering, and occupied himself with play and pleasure. When his well-wishers spoke to him about this, and inquired whether it was the time for pleasure and enjoyment, he said, "As these are my <sup>1</sup> last breaths, I wish that they should pass with <sup>2</sup> joy and in the fulfilment of desires."

On the 9th of Sha'bān in <sup>3</sup> the year 937 A.H. (May 25th, 1528), at the time of the true dawn, the standards of state of Bahādur Shāh arose above the horizon of the fort of Mandū. At the same moment Chānd Khān, son of Sultān Muẓaffar, descended from the fort, and took the path of flight. Sultān Maḥmūd armed himself, and with a small body of followers met Sultān Bahādur; but finding that he had not the power to withstand him, and considering that the slaughter of the inmates of his harem should precede his own <sup>4</sup> death, <sup>5</sup> advanced towards the palace with about a thousand horsemen. His men leaving their horses (outside), entered the palaces; but Sultān Bahādur's troops had (already) surrounded them. Sultān Bahādur sent a message to the

<sup>1</sup> The readings in the MSS. appear to be انفس باز پسین اقبالش بارهلتی, and in the lith. ed. انفس با سپن. None of these appear to be correct. The reading in the lith. ed. of Firishtah انفس واپسین is correct and I have adopted it.

<sup>2</sup> The MSS. and the lith. ed. all have طرب و شوق. Firishtah lith. ed. has the more commonplace عیش و عشرت.

<sup>3</sup> See note 5, page 353, as to the day. The date according to the Christian era is given by Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 268) as May 20th, 1526 A.D.; but March 17th, 1531, is the date in the Cambridge History of India, page 369, of the capture of Mandū by Bahādur Shāh.

<sup>4</sup> One MS. has by mistake مردن instead of مردن.

<sup>5</sup> One MS. has by mistake خود instead of گردید. The other MS. has شد.

effect that there was protection and safety for Sultān Maḥmūd and the inmates of his harem, and his *amīrs*; and no one would interfere with anybody's honour or property. Some of the men, who were specially near to Sultān Maḥmūd, kept him back from killing<sup>1</sup> the members of his family; and told him, that the *Bādshāh* of Gujrāt although he might be bad to him, his badness would be better than the goodness of others. (They also said), that there was a strong belief, that when he would go and meet Bahādur Shāh, the latter would again entrust the rule of the country to him. While this was going on, Sultān Bahādur had entered the palace of Sultān Maḥmūd and had taken up a position with his *amīrs* on the terrace of *La'l Maḥal*; and sent a man to summon Sultān Maḥmūd.<sup>2</sup> The latter left his *sardārs* in the palace and himself came<sup>3</sup> to Sultān Bahādur with only seven of his *sardārs*.

The Sultān, (that is Sultān Bahādur) showed him every respect and honour, and they embraced each other. After sitting down, Sultān Maḥmūd used<sup>4</sup> a little harsh language; and after that the two Sultāns remained silent till the end of the meeting. But it is narrated, that the effects of a change in Sultān Bahādur's disposition made its appearance. The words which were used in that *majlis* were these,<sup>5</sup> "I have given an assurance of safety to the Maḥmūd Shāhi *amīrs*. Let them go and settle down in their residences; to

<sup>1</sup> One MS. has عيال, the other has no corresponding word: while the lith. ed. has محل.

<sup>2</sup> One MS. leaves out Sultān Maḥmūd, and the lith. ed. Maḥmūd.

<sup>3</sup> One MS. has by mistake فرستاد instead of آمد; and then adds also by mistake سلطان محمود بهادر آمد.

<sup>4</sup> Firishtah lith. ed. has سلطان بهادر اندک درشتی کرده ساکن شد, but he adds further on:

و در بعضی نسخها بنظر آمد که چون سلطان محمود در تکلم درشتی نمود و شاه بهادر شاه گجراتی که در مقام عقوبت حکم حبس فرمود -

Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 268) says, "Bahadur Shah was disposed to treat him kindly, and even to restore to him his government; but the irritability of Sooltan Mahmood's temper and his pride combined hurried him away so far, that he abused Bahadur Shah grossly to his face." The Cambridge History of India is silent about the interview between the two Sultāns in both the sections about Gujārāt and Mālwa.

<sup>5</sup> One MS. omits by mistake the words from امان دادیم رفته.



On the morning following that night Āṣaf Khān and Iqbāl Khān made preparations for putting him in a shroud and burying him; and buried him on the bank of the reservoir of Dahūd. His seven sons were kept in imprisonment in Chāmpānīr.

The<sup>1</sup> period of his reign was twenty years and six months and eleven days.

## 2 AN ACCOUNT OF THE RULE OF SULTĀN BAHĀDUR.

After the death of Sultān Muzaḥḥār, the country of Mālwa came into the possession of Sultān Bahādur; and most of the *amīrs* of Sultān Muzaḥḥār came to him. As Silhadi *Pūrabiya* had entered the service before all the other *amīrs*, *sarkārs* of Ujjain and Sārangpūr and the fort of Rāisin were allotted to him as his *jūgīr*. After the rains, the Sultān went to <sup>3</sup>see Burhānpūr. Bhūpat the son of Silhadi was with him. As signs of turbulence and recusancy became apparent from the circumstances of Silhadi, the Sultān at the time of his return sent <sup>4</sup>Amin Nasir to bring Silhadi to him, and he (Silhadi) passed the time by various tricks of delay; till in the town of Dhār he <sup>5</sup>was seized by the talons of fate, as has been written in the section about Gujrāt. Sultān Bahādur advanced towards Ujjain, in order to chastise

--

<sup>1</sup> Both MSS. omit *ایام*.

<sup>2</sup> The heading is as I have it in the text in both MSS., but one of the MSS. adds the word Gujrātī after Sultān Bahādur. The lith. ed. omits the word *حکومت*.

<sup>3</sup> One MS. omits *سور*.

<sup>4</sup> He is called *امین نصیر* in both MSS. in this place; but about the various names by which he was called, and the result of his mission to summon Silhadi, see page 356 and note 2 on the same page, in the section about Gujrāt.

<sup>5</sup> The readings are somewhat different, and the meaning is not quite clear. One MS. has *در قصبه دمدار بجنگ قضا گرفتار شود*. The other has the same reading but the word *بجنگ* is written as *بچنگ*. The lith. ed. has Hār instead of Dhār, which is of course incorrect; but otherwise agrees with the reading in the second MS. The corresponding passage in *Firishtah* *بجنگ غضب سلطان بهادر گرفتار آمد* is perhaps somewhat better. Silhadi was not killed at this time. It cannot therefore be said, that he was seized by the talons of destiny or fate. He certainly incurred the wrath of Sultān Bahādur; but *بجنگ غضب* or the battle of wrath has hardly any meaning. *چنگ غضب* or talons of wrath is certainly better.



all the *Pūrabhīṃs*. Silhadi's son fled from Ujjain; and went to Chitōr. Sultān Bahādur bestowed Ujjain on <sup>1</sup> Daryā Khān Mandōwālī; and advanced to Rāṣin. On the way he left Ḥabīb Khān at Āshṭa; and Mallū Khān, son of Mallū Khān, at Sārangpūr; and went and besieged the fort of Rāṣin. When the period of the siege was protracted, and unknown images appeared on the pages of the world, Silhadi of evil destiny, after he had become a Musalmān performed *jaubar*, and met his death. This matter has been narrated in detail in the accounts of Sultān Bahādur in the section about Gujrāt. Sultān Bahādur, having entrusted Rāṣin, and the neighbouring districts, to Sultān 'Ālam Kālpīwāl, returned to Gujrāt. He then left Ikhtiyār Khān in charge of the government of the fort of Mandū; and advanced towards Chāmpānir.

In the year 940 A.H., 1533 A.D., he collected troops, and advanced to conquer Chitōr. <sup>2</sup> After besieging it, he, owing to certain matters, made an amicable settlement, and returned to Aḥmadābād. In the year 941 A.H., he again collected troops, and besieged Chitōr. After the conquest of Chitōr, he fled, in the neighbourhood of Mandīśōr before His Majesty Jinnat Āshīānī Humāyūn *Bādshāh*; and retired to Gujrāt, as has been narrated in its place.

#### AN ACCOUNT OF THE RULE OF THE DEPUTIES OF HIS MAJESTY JINNAT ĀSHIĀNĪ, MUḤAMMAD HUMĀYŪN BĀDShĀH.

When the country of Mālwa, and in fact the country of Gujrāt also came into the possession of the servants of the powerful Chaghtāi government, His Majesty, after the conquest of Gujrāt, left Mirzā 'Askari and Yādgar Nāsir Mirzā in Gujrāt; and himself went to Mandū. After one year <sup>3</sup> Divine jealousy came into operation. The Mirzās and all the *amīrs* abandoned Gujrāt without any war having taken place; and went towards Āgra. These events have been mentioned in their own place. His Majesty, Jinnat Āshīānī also, for reasons of

<sup>1</sup> Firishtah calls him Daryā Khān Lūdt; but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 270) has Budr Khan, having joined the preposition *به* to *در* and omitting *یا*.

<sup>2</sup> One MS. leaves out by mistake the words from *از محاصره* to *و بعد از محاصره* *به احمدآباد سرگشت*.

<sup>3</sup> The words are *غیرت الهی* Divine jealousy, or probably Divine wrath.

state, left Mālwa; and went away to Āgra. For the period of one year the country of Mālwa was in the possession of the Chaghltāi rulers.

<sup>1</sup> AN ACCOUNT OF MALLŪ KHĀN, QĀDIR SHĀH.

When owing to the death of Sultān Bahādur, there was disorder in the country of Gujrāt, and the country of Mālwa remained without a ruler: at about that time His Majesty Jinnat Āshīānī turned the bridle of departure from Āgra towards the country of Bangāla. <sup>2</sup> Mallū Khān, son of Mallū Khān gave himself, in concert with the *amīrs* of Mālwa, the title of Qādir Shāh. He brought the country, from the town of Bhilsā to the vicinity of the Narbada river into his possession; and divided it among the old *amīrs*. Bhūpat Rāy and Pūran Mal, the sons of Silhadī came back from the territory of Chitōr, and took possession of the fort of Rāisin, and its neighbourhood. The power and grandeur of Qādir Shāh increased day by day; and the *zamīndārs* of all the surrounding country acknowledged allegiance to him, and sent him tribute every year.

And gradually things came to such a pass, that <sup>2</sup> Shēr Khān Afghān, at the time when His Majesty Jinnat Āshīānī was engaged in trying to effect his destruction, sent a *farmān* to him from Bengal,

---

<sup>1</sup> There are slight differences in the headings in the MS. One has ذکر ملو خان and the other has ذکر قادر شاه. The heading in the lith. ed. ذکر دؤور ملطی بهادر گجراتی عنو قادر شاه is certainly incorrect.





When he arrived in the district of Ujjain, <sup>1</sup>Shēr Khān gave him as a matter of unconsidered hurry, the *sarkār* of Lakhnauti in exchange for the country of Mālwa. He also ordered that Qādir Shāh should send his family and dependants to Lakhnauti and should himself remain in attendance on him. Mallū Khān brought his family and children to the city of Ujjain, and took up his residence in a garden which was located between the camp and the city. One day he was going from his residence to wait upon Shēr Khān, when he saw, on the way, that a number of Mughals of Gwāliar were engaged in cutting earth with their spades, and working the earth in properly constructing the bastions of the fort which (Shēr Khān's officers) always built round his camp. Mallū Khān considered in his mind, "If I accompany Shēr Khān, he will of course order me to do similar earth work", and he determined on flight, and was engaged in thinking how he he should manage it. Shēr Khān, becoming cognizant of this, said to Shujā'at Khān "From some improper acts, which have been committed by Mallū, it has come into my mind, that I should chastise and punish him; but as he came and made his submission to me without being sent for, it was right that I should please him. Now that he has come to this place, do not say anything to him, so that he might go away." Mallū finding an opportunity fled. When Shēr Khān received this news, he sent a detachment in pursuit; and he mounted himself and after going a part of the way stopped; and the *amīrs* who had been sent in pursuit, went a part of the way, and then returned. Sikandar Khān Sawāsī lest he should also escape was made over to jailors.

Mallū Khān's rule was for six years.

<sup>1</sup> Firishtah explains, that contrary to the expectation of Qādir Shāh Shēr Shāh, being tempted to keep Mālwa for himself gave him the *sarkār* Lakhnauti. I am not quite sure about the meaning of the expression, which is used by Nizām-ud-dīn also; but I suppose it has the meaning I have given it in the text. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 272) says, Sheer Shah "conferred on him the district of Luknow as a residence". The MSS. also have سرکار لکھنوتی in place of سرکار لکھنو and the lith. ed. also has سرکار لکھنو in one place; but Firishtah lith. ed. has *sarkār* Lakhnauti, and the Cambridge History of India, page 370, has "the government of Bengal". In the text-edition M. Hidayat Hosain has adopted Lucknow.

When the country of Mālwa came into the possession of Shēr Khān, he lasted for some days in the town of Ujjain, and occupied himself in arranging and regulating the affairs of that *Sūbah*.<sup>3</sup> He gave the towns of Ujjain and Sāranpūr to Shujā' Khān, who is generally known by the name of Sajāwal Khān, and entrusted the government of the whole country of Mālwa to him. He appointed Hājī Khān Sultān to Dhār and the neighbouring country.<sup>4</sup> Natū Khān was appointed to the sarkār of Hāndiyah and that neighbourhood. He then advanced towards the fort of Rantambhōr. After a few days news came that<sup>5</sup> Nasir Khān, the son of Sikandar Khān, brother of Sikandar Khān, who was in imprisonment had come forward to attack Natū Khān. Shujā' Khān collected his men and advanced

<sup>3</sup> This anecdote and the couplet are also mentioned on page 169 of the second volume of the English translation in the history of Shēr Khān's reign.

<sup>4</sup> The heading is differently given. One MS. has ذکر حکومت شجاع خان. The other MS. omits the words حکومت; while the lith. ed. has ذکر شجاع خان به نیابت شیر شاہ. In the text-edition M. Hidayat Hosain has ذکر شجاع خان or an account of Shujā' Khān.

<sup>5</sup> The Cambridge History of India, page 370, says, "And retired from Mālwa, leaving behind him as viceroy Hājī Khān and Shujā'at Khān as governor of Satwās." This statement agrees with that on page 168 of this volume; but the statement made in the *Ṭabaqāt* and by Firishtah at this place is different.

<sup>1</sup> بنو خان Banū Khān in the text-edition.

<sup>2</sup> The text is a translation of the reading in the MSS.; but the lith. ed. and the lith. ed. of Firishtah have نصیر خان بن سکندر خان محبوب بیچنگ شجاعت خان. This may be the correct version, as there is no mention of what Natū Khān did to meet the attack. On the other hand even the lith. ed. (though not Firishtah) says that Shujā'at Khān advanced to Satwās and Hāndiyah, which he would not have done, if he had been attacked himself.

towards Satwās and Hündiyah. After the two sides had met, Naṣīr Khān entered into a compact with some of his <sup>1</sup> retainers and courtiers, that they should devote all their energies to seize Shujā' Khān alive, in retaliation for Sikandar Khān, so that the latter might perhaps in this way obtain his release. Then after the flames of slaughter and destruction had blazed up, Naṣīr Khān and some of his servants, gradually <sup>2</sup> with great patience, brought themselves close to where Shujā' Khān was, and seizing him by his collar, and the hair of his head went back towards their own army. In the meantime Mubārak Khān <sup>3</sup> Sarwānī coming to know of what had happened, betook himself to where Shujā' Khān was, and fighting bravely released him. He fought so hard, however, that one of his legs was severed below the knee joint; and he fell off from his horse. Naṣīr Khān's soldiers wanted to cut off his head from his body; but Rājā Rām Shāh of <sup>4</sup> Gwāliar, who was in the service of Shujā' Khān, in concert with some Rājputs, advanced to help Mubārak Khān Sarwānī, and carried him off (from the field). <sup>5</sup> Naṣīr Khān did all that was required of him in the way of bravely exerting himself, but in the end victory and triumph showed their face to Shujā' Khān. Naṣīr Khān fled, and went into the country of Gōndwāna.

As Shujā' Khān had <sup>6</sup> six wounds on his face and his arms, they lifted him, and carried him victorious and triumphant, <sup>7</sup> to his own

<sup>1</sup> Both MSS. and the lith. ed. have نوکران مضاحب without any conjunction between the two words.

<sup>2</sup> The words in the MS. and in the lith. ed. are تحمل نموده, the meaning of which is not quite clear.

<sup>3</sup> The word is سروانی in one MS. and سرینی in the other and in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has سروانی. In the text-edition M. Hidayat Ḥosain has adopted سرینی Sirēnī.

<sup>4</sup> The word is گوالیار and گوالیری in the MS. and گوالیر in the lith. ed.

<sup>5</sup> One MS. omits by mistake the words from نصیر خان روی نموده.

<sup>6</sup> One MS. has by mistake برای instead of روی. Firishtah has five or six wounds.

<sup>7</sup> The readings are somewhat obscure. The MSS. have بجا در آوردند, which has some meaning but which does not say to what place he was carried. The reading in the lith. ed. is در حضور او بردند i.e., carried him into his presence; but this also leaves out the name of the person into whose presence he was carried. Firishtah in the corresponding passage has در چاه در انداخته بدایرة بردند. This

place. They had not yet bound up his wounds, when a letter came from Hājī Khān Sultānī to the purport, that Mallū Khān had come from Bānswālah with a large force to attack him; and that a battle was a matter of today or tomorrow. Shujā' Khān seated himself that very day and in the condition in which he was in a *sukhāsan* and advanced to reinforce Hājī Khān; and with only the night intervening (*i.e.*, on the following morning) Shujā' Khān came up with one hundred and fifty horsemen in the vicinity of <sup>1</sup> Kūmli Mawāsah. He awakened Hājī Khān from his sleep, and the same moment without any delay began <sup>2</sup> the battle, and defeated Mallū Khān. The latter fled in great distress and wretchedness, and went away to Gujrāt; and <sup>3</sup> did not again gird up his loins.

The power and splendour of Shujā' Khān increased day by day; and gradually he brought the whole of Mālwa into his possession. When Shēr Khān passed away in the neighbourhood of Kālinjar, and the duties of the *saltanat* devolved on Islām Khān. The latter, although he was still displeased with Shujā' Khān, but as <sup>4</sup> Daulat Khān Ajīyālā, who was the adopted son of Shujā' Khān, was a great favourite

would be perfectly clear if we knew what چاه in this place means, or for what word it is printed by mistake. He could not very well have been thrown into a pit or a well, and then taken to his camp. It would be all right if چاه meant some kind of conveyance, or the word was a misprint for some words which meant a conveyance of some kind. As it is, it makes confusion worse confounded. M. Hidayat Hōsain has لشکر گاه *i.e.*, to the army camp, in the text-edition.

<sup>1</sup> The name is written with some little variation in the MSS. and the lith. ed. The MSS. have کوملی مواسه and کوملی سراسه; and the lith. ed. has کوملی مراضه. The name is not mentioned by Firishtah or by any other historians as far as I know. M. Hidayat Hōsain has کوملی بدواسه in the text-edition.

<sup>2</sup> Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 273) says that Kadur Shah was defeated in a night attack, but this does not appear to be correct.

<sup>3</sup> One MS. and the lith. ed. have باز کمر نه بست, but the other MS. has باز کمر بست, which is of course incorrect.

<sup>4</sup> Firishtah calls him Daulat Khān without any suffix. He is called Daulat Khān Ajyāra in the Cambridge History of India, page 370, but on the next page the suffix is printed as Ajyāra instead of Ajyāra.



of <sup>1</sup>Islām Khān, in order to please the son, did not withdraw the appearance of outward favour from the father; and showed him all esteem and regard; and placed the reins of the affairs of the entire country of Mālwa in the grasp of his powerful hand. This state of things continued till one day a man of the name of 'Uṭhmān Khān in a state of drunkenness came into Shujā' Khān's audience hall, and repeatedly spat on the carpets. When the *farrāsh* (the man who looks after carpets, etc.) forbade him, 'Uṭhmān jumped up, and struck the *farrāsh* with his fist. There was much noise. The *farrāsh* told Shujā' Khān what had happened. He ordered, "First, he was drunk, second, he came into the audience hall, and third, he struck the *farrāsh* with his fist." He said that both his hands should be cut off. 'Uṭhmān Khān came to <sup>2</sup>Gwāliar, and complained to Islām Khān. After some time, Shujā' Khān came to Gwāliar to attend on Islām Khān. One day 'Uṭhmān Khān went to wait on Islām Khān, and complained about what he had suffered. Islām Khān was angry with him, and said, "You also are an Afghān; go and have your revenge."

They say, that on hearing this news Shujā' Khān became aggrieved at <sup>3</sup>Islām Khān's proceedings; and spoke unseemly words. While these things were happening, one day one of Shujā' Khān's intimate friends came and informed him, that 'Uṭhmān Khān was sitting in a blacksmith's shop, and was sharpening his knife; and speaking absurd words. Shujā' Khān in his great pride was not restrained by these words, till one day when, riding on his *sukhāsan*, he went to the fort of Gwāliar, to offer his *salāms* to Islām Khān. When he came by the Hatiyāpōl gate, he saw that 'Uṭhmān Khān was seated in a shop

<sup>1</sup> The name is written Aslīm Khān here in both MSS. and Aslam Khān in the lith. ed., but as he has been called Islām Khān in previous and succeeding passages, I have kept that spelling.

<sup>2</sup> This is apparently the Gwāliar in the Punjab hills. Firishtah calls it گوالیار کہ دار الملک سلیم شاہ افغان سور بود.

<sup>3</sup> The MSS. and the lith. ed. all have the name as Salīm Khān here, but I have retained Islām Khān. Firishtah lith. ed. says Shujā' Khān became angry and spoke unseemly words about Shēr Shāh. This can scarcely be correct, as he had no grievance against the latter. On the other hand, Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 274) says that Shooja Khan merely said, "Sulim Shah is a fool for his pains."

<sup>1</sup> wrapped up in an old mantle. Shujā' Khān wanted to enquire from him about the matter on the way. But 'Uthmān Khān suddenly jumped up from the platform of the shop, and wounded Shujā' Khān. The *silāhdārs*, or armed retainers, who were accompanying the *sukhāsan*, immediately seized him. They saw that he had an iron hand, rudely fashioned, which he had firmly fixed in the place of the severed hand; and with that badly fashioned hand, he had thrown <sup>2</sup> a dart. The *silāhdārs* killed him on the spot; and turning back the *sukhāsan* of the <sup>3</sup> Khān took him to his residence. The wound was on his left side; but as 'Uthmān Khān's hand had no strength, it was only skin deep.

When Shujā' Khān was wounded, and 'Uthmān Khān got his deserts, there was a noise and tumult among the men in the camp. Islām Khān, on receiving the news, sent the great men and the chiefs of the state, to make enquiries. He wanted also to come and visit him. But Shujā' Khān had understood, that his sons and other near relations suspected that ('Uthmān's) audacity was due to the instigation and encouragement of Islām Khān. He, therefore, had regard to their <sup>4</sup> fearlessness, and did not approve of Islām Khān's coming to him, and sent the following message, "This slave is a slave of <sup>5</sup> your

<sup>1</sup> The readings are different here and are all more or less unintelligible. One MS. has *و خود را بکدر برهنه پیچیده*. The lith. ed. has *مست پیچیده*. Firishtah lith. ed. has in the corresponding passage *خود را بکتر کهنه پیچیده* and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 274) has "wrapt up in an old mantle." This latter would be all right, if *کتر* meant a mantle, but I cannot find that it has this meaning. However, for want of anything better, I have adopted it.

<sup>2</sup> Here again the readings are somewhat different. Both MSS. and Firishtah lith. ed. have *جعلی ضربی*, while the lith. ed. has *عملی حربی*. The latter appears to be incorrect, but I cannot find any meaning of *جعل* which would suit the context. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 247) has, "With the blade of a sword." M. Hidayat Hōsain has *بآن دست ناقص جعلی انداخته*, i.e., struck a blow with his useless artificial hand, in the text-edition.

<sup>3</sup> One MS. has Shujā' before Khān.

<sup>4</sup> One MS. has by mistake *بی انکه* instead of *بی باکی*.

<sup>5</sup> The pronoun *ایشان* is in the third person, although *شما* is also used in the same sentence. There are also differences in the readings. One MS. has *که بنده غلام پدر ایشان است*, while the other MS. has *بنده و غلام پدر ایشان است* and the lith. ed. has *که من بن غلام پدر ایشان*. Shujā' Khān's message

father, and has never excused himself from death or from being slain; he was among the thirty persons who first joined your father and planted the standard of your greatness, as is known to everybody. And even now if he carries his life in safety from this danger, he may be of use to you. This slave does not wish to give you so much trouble that you should come down from the fort and cover all this distance; and indeed these inquiries and favours have been the cause of much distinction to this slave, and have greatly exalted him."

As Shujā' Khān was one of the great pillars of Islām Khān's government, and had the rights derived from having performed much service, Islām Khān, in spite of the fact that he had understood from his words what he was saying (or rather, what he meant), waited patiently that day, but on the following day he went to enquire about him. This *faqīr* (the author) has heard from some men, who had relations of friendship with Shujā' Khān, and were <sup>1</sup> present in that *majlis*, that Fath Khān, the uncle-in-law of the sons of Shēr Khān, who was so well known for his great strength that no one could seize and twist his hand by intertwining his fingers with his own, (this is a favourite test in India even now), when he saw Islām Khān enter Shujā' Khān's pavilion alone, wanted to remove him out of the way, and held a consultation in this matter by signs and gestures with Miyān Bāyazīd, son of Shujā' Khān, who afterwards assumed the title of Bāz Bahādur; and Miyān Bāyazīd also concurred with him in this matter. Shujā' Khān, becoming aware of this, sent Fath Khān away to collect the things required for the tribute (which had to be placed before Islām Khān); and after a moment said farewell to Islām Khān. He told the latter distinctly that after this, he should not take the trouble to come again, for he said, "This slave apprehends lest the rights acquired by long service be destroyed; and the standard of greatness, which has been raised by enduring so much trouble and difficulty, be brought down at once."

---

to Islām Khān as given by Firishtah agrees generally with that in the text, but according to Firishtah, Shujā' Khān was one of the six and thirty and (not five and thirty) men who planted the standard of Salīm Shūh's (or Shēr Shah's) greatness.

<sup>1</sup> One MS. has by mistake حاجی instead of حاتم.

After some days, when <sup>1</sup> Shujā' Khān bathed, and alms and charity were distributed to deserving people; he one day mounted his horse and went to make his *salām* to Islām Khān. The latter bestowed one hundred and one horses and one hundred and one packages of various stuffs of Bangāla as rewards to the Khān. But as Shujā' Khān found out from his manner and behaviour, that these cajolries were filled with enmity, he passed the day in any way that was possible, and then coming back to his quarters spoke to his servants, that they should load his camp equipages. The people of the city thought that as that camping ground had become dirty, he wanted to remove to another place. But when all his men had loaded up everything he armed himself, and then ordered that they should beat the drum of departure. He then mounted his horse, and took the road to Sārangpūr. Islām Khān, on seeing this, became angry, and detached a body of soldiers to pursue him; and collecting his army he himself also advanced towards Sārangpūr. On arrival at that place Shujā' Khān commenced to equip his men; and when he heard that Islām Khān was coming, some of his men tried to <sup>2</sup> persuade him to fight with the latter. He, however, said, "Islām Khān is the son of my late master and benefactor; I shall never fight with him; and I shall not allow that any one of my people should have such an intention in his mind." After the arrival of Islām Khān in the neighbourhood of Sārangpūr, Shujā' Khān came out of the city, and sending the families and dependants of his men in advance, went away in the direction of Bānswālah.

Islām Khān took possession of Mālwa, and leaving 'Īsā Khān Sūr with twenty-two thousand horsemen in the town of Ujjain, returned to Gwāliar. Shujā' Khān, although he had the power and the necessary force, never caused any damage to the country of Mālwa. As Islām Khān (at this time) advanced towards Lāhōre, on account of the rebellion of the Niyāzis, Daulat Khān Ajiyālā, who was a favourite of Islām Khān, and an adopted son of Shujā' Khān, prayed for the pardon of the guilt of the latter. Shujā' Khān then came and rendered

---

<sup>1</sup> Apparently in those days, people did not bathe when they were ill or had a wound.

<sup>2</sup> The word is جدل in one MS. and in the lith. ed., but it is جدال in the other MS.; the latter reading is adopted in the text-edition.

homage to Islām Khān, who drew the pen of forgiveness across the page of his offences; and bestowed Sārangpūr, and the country of Rāisīn, and some other *Maḥals* (estates) on him. He also gave him one hundred and one horses and much stuff and a gold ewer and basin, and granted him permission to return. When Shujā' Khān went to his *jāgīr*, and Islām Khān, after a considerable time, passed away by natural death; and the *salṭanat* was settled on Mubārīz Khān 'Adalī; the latter, <sup>1</sup> either on account of ancient acquaintance, or on account of the relationship of his being the husband of one of his wife's sisters, conferred the entire country of Mālwa permanently on him. Shujā' Khān then conferred the government of Ujjain and the *parganas* in its neighbourhood on Daulat Khān Ājīyālā; and Rāisīn and Bhilsā on his youngest son <sup>2</sup> Malik Muṣṭafā, who was (afterwards) appointed to accompany Rāja Bīr Bal and Ḥakīm Abū-ul Faṭḥ in the Yūsuf Zai expedition and was killed there. He gave the government of Hāndiyah and Āshta to Miṣṣān Bāyazīd; and himself took up his residence in Sārangpūr. When a long time had passed in this way, and disorders took place in the *salṭanat* of Dehli, and everyone became independent in the corner in which he was, Shujā' Khān passed away by a natural death. <sup>3</sup> The period of the government of Shujā' Khān was 12 years.

#### <sup>4</sup> AN ACCOUNT OF BAZ BAHĀDUR, SON OF SHUJĀ' KHĀN.

After the death of Shujā' Khān, Bāyazīd, his eldest son, betook himself to Sārangpūr, and took possession of all his father's property and retainers. As Daulat Khān Ājīyālā, owing to the proximity of

<sup>1</sup> One MS. omits the first چه and substitutes بجهت for the second. Firishtah in the corresponding passage has نسبت سابقه اسلاف. I find that one of the meanings of اسلاف in the dictionary is "the husbands of a man's wife's sisters." I have taken the word to mean this in this passage.

<sup>2</sup> ملك مصطفی in the text-edition. The clause corresponding to "who was (afterwards) appointed to accompany . . . . . and was killed there" is omitted in the text-edition.

<sup>3</sup> According to Firishtah he died in 962 A.H. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 275) gives 1551 A.D. as the corresponding year, but the Cambridge History of India, page 371, places his death in 1555, after Humāyūn had regained the empire.

<sup>4</sup> One MS. omits بن شجاع خل.



that place was in the occupation of a band of Miyānas (Miyāna Afghāns) and he did not meet with such treatment from them as he desired he slew a number of <sup>1</sup> their *sardārs*, who were accompanying him, by throwing them into wells; and then advanced to fight the rest of that band. They fortified themselves, and did not show themselves at all backward in fighting with him. Fath K̄hān the uncle-in-law of Bāz Bahādur, some account of whom has been given before, received a cannon <sup>2</sup> ball here and was killed. In the end Bāz Bahādur took possession of Kadrūlā, and came back to Sārangpūr.

After sometime, he advanced with a well-equipped army, with the object of conquering *Garh* Katinkah. When he arrived in that country, Rānī Durgāwatī, who was the wife of the Rāja of Katinkah, and after his death ruled the country, collected the *Kōndwān* and commenced a battle at the head of the *Ghātī* (pass). As the Rānī's infantry were more numerous than ants and locusts, they surrounded the men from all sides of the *Ghātī*. Bāz Bahādur in distress and dismay took the path of flight, and all his suite and equipages fell into the Rānī's hands. Many of his best men <sup>3</sup> remained there. He himself, with very great trouble, betook himself to Sārangpūr, and began to repair the damages and losses in his army.

As he had undergone much hardship, he now desired that he should spend some days in pleasure. He collected musicians and singers from every place where they were, and occupied himself all day and night in (sensual) pleasure and enjoyment.

<sup>4</sup> Then in the months of the year <sup>5</sup> 967 A.H., when the desire

The place is not mentioned by Col. Briggs, but it is called Kelwāra in the Cambridge History of India, page 371. In the text-edition M. Hidayat Hosain has adopted کدوارہ .

<sup>1</sup> Firihtah and Col. Briggs do not say that it was the *sardārs* or *Miyānas* who were thrown into the well. Firihtah says وچمن بعضی سرداران او ملوک نمودند ; and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 277) says, "Having met with opposition from some of his officers", etc.

<sup>2</sup> The word is توپ in the text, and گلولہ in Firihtah lith. ed.

<sup>3</sup> Firihtah explains اکثر بقتل آمدند i.e., most of these men were slain.

<sup>4</sup> The sentence begins with تا آنکه, but as it would hardly be possible to begin a paragraph with "Till in the, etc." I have begun it with "Then, etc."

<sup>5</sup> The MSS. have سبع و سبعین و تسعمائے, i.e., 977 A.H. which is incorrect. Firihtah lith. ed. has ثمان و ستین و تسعمائے, and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 278)

of conquering Mālwa found a place in the head, which touched the sky, of His Majesty, the Khalifa-i-Ilāhī, may God perpetuate the shadow of his kindness over the people! he sent Adham Khān and Pir Muḥammad Khān and Sādiq Khān <sup>1</sup> and Qiyā Khān and Shāh Muḥammad Khān Qandahārī and his son 'Ādil Muḥammad, and Muḥib 'Alī Khān and a number of others from among his servants to effect it. The great *amīrs* advanced towards Sārangpūr by successive marches. When they arrived in the neighbourhood of the village of <sup>2</sup> Kaitūr, which is one *farsukh* from Sārangpūr, Bāz Bahādur rose from the company of the singing women, and marched forward to fight with brave men. Although a large number of Afghāns, who had performed many feats of arms and seen much fighting, were collected together in his service, yet as good fortune was not his guide, he fled after <sup>3</sup> a little fighting; and that country came into the possession of the servants of the triumphant greatness (*i.e.*, the empire of Akbar). The details of this battle, <sup>4</sup> and the remaining battles, which took place in Mālwa, have been narrated, distinctly and in detail, in the history of His Majesty, the Khalifā-i-Ilāhī. May God perpetuate His benevolence and favour on the people and may God prolong the days of his life to the day of resurrection!

Bāz Bahādur had a wife Rūpmatī by name, <sup>5</sup> who loved him and was enamoured of him; and in the verses which he composed in the Hindi language he often inserted her name. He had a great passion for the society of women and the company of musicians.

He ruled in the country of Mālwa for a period of sixteen years. After his flight from the country of Mālwa he went to Gujrāt. He next

---

has in the latter end of the year 968 A.H., 1560 A.D. The Cambridge History of India, page 371, has 1561.

<sup>1</sup> One MS. omits Qiyā Khān.

<sup>2</sup> The name is written as کیتور in one MS. and the lith. ed., and کنور in the other MS. Firishlah does not give the name of the place, but says, when the Mughal army got to one *karōh* from Sārangpūr; and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 278) has "within a short distance of his capital, when he collected his troops around Sarangpoor, but they had hardly time to join, before the Moguls were within two miles of the place."

<sup>3</sup> One MS. omits the word اندک.

<sup>4</sup> The same MS. omits the conjunction و and.

<sup>5</sup> It is not quite clear whether the author means that Rūpmatī loved Bāz Bahādur and was enamoured of him, or *vice versa*.



went to the Rānā, who was the ruler of the fort of Kōnbhalmīr and Chitōr from Gujrāt; and from there, he went and waited on His Majesty the Khalifa-i-Nāhi, and was enrolled in the band of his servants. He remained in that service for several years, till he surrendered the deposit of his life. The country of Mālwa is up to the present day in the possession of the Viceroys of this daily increasing power.

## SECTION IX. <sup>1</sup>THE SECTION ABOUT THE SULTĀNS OF KASHMĪR.

From the year <sup>2</sup>747 A.H. to the year 995 A.H., 249 years <sup>3</sup> was the period of the rule of the Musalmān Sultāns in the country of Kashmīr. <sup>4</sup> The beginning was from Āl-i-Tāhir.

<sup>5</sup> Let it not remain concealed that the country of Kashmīr was always in the possession of Rājās, who ruled <sup>6</sup> one after another, till the year 750 A.H., which was in the time of the rule of <sup>7</sup> Rāja Sirdēr

<sup>1</sup> The heading in the text is that in the lith. ed. The headings in the MSS. are *طبقہ حکام کسیر بقو* and *طبقہ حکام سلاطین نقر*, which are both incorrect.

<sup>2</sup> As regards the chronology of the Musalmān Kings of Kashmīr, see page 100 of *J.A.S.B.*, vol. LIV (1885), where Mr. C. J. Rogers working back from 795 A.H., the date of the death of Kutub-ud-Din, places the accession of Shams-ud-Din or Shāh Mir in 743 A.H. This differs from the year in the text by four years.

<sup>3</sup> The words from *طاهر* to *مدت* do not occur in one MS. The other MS. and the lith. ed. have them with slight variations. I have adopted the words in the first MS., but in the text-edition the last sentence (see note 4 below) is omitted.

<sup>4</sup> This sentence is written as *ابتداء از آل طاهر* in one MS. It is not to be found in any other MS. or the text-edition.

<sup>5</sup> In the text-edition M. Hidayat Hosain inserts the heading *ذکر حکومت* above this line and not a page or so later as in the translation.

<sup>6</sup> One MS. has by mistake *از بی* instead of *یکدیگر*.

<sup>7</sup> The name is written as *سردیر* Sirdēr and *سردیرا* Sirdērā in the MS. and *میردیر* in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has *سیددیر* Siah Dev. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 451) has Sena Dew, and the Cambridge History of India, page 277, has Sinha Deva. According to Jonarāja's Chronicle, line 129, Rāja Simhadeva died in his 77th year after reigning for fourteen years and three days less than six months and was succeeded by his brother Sūhadeva. It was in

a man of the name of <sup>1</sup> Shāh Mīr, who described his ancestry as follows : Shāh Mīr, son of Tāhīr Āl, son of <sup>2</sup> Karshāshab, son of Nēkrūz, and referred the end (or rather the beginning) of his ancestry to Arjun, who was of the Pāṇḍus; and the history of the Pāṇḍus is mentioned in the Mahābhārat, which has been translated by the order of His

his reign, that many people came from distant countries in quest of service.

مردیور in the text-edition.

<sup>1</sup> The name is شاه میر Shāh Mīr in both MSS. and in the lith. ed. It is Shah Meer in Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 451), but it is شاه میرزا Shāh Mīrzā in the lith. ed. of Firishtah, and in the Cambridge History of India. In the books in the somewhat imposing list of the Bibliography, page 650, to Chapter xii of the Cambridge History of India, vol. III, which deals with the history of the kingdom of Kashmir, there is only one mention of the name of the man; and this is on page 130 of the Introduction in Sir Aurel Stein's translation of Kalhaṇa's *Rājatarāṅgiṇī*, vol. I (1900). In this place he is called Shāh Mīr, so it is difficult to find where Sir Wolseley Haig, who compiled the account in the Cambridge History of India got his authority for calling him Shāh Mīrzā. In the *J.R.A.S.*, vol. L (1918, pp. 451-468) there is a paper called "the Chronology and genealogy of the Muhammadan kings of Kashmir", which is also mentioned in the Bibliography and which is also written by the same author, Lt.-Col. T. W. Haig. In this paper he says, "My materials chiefly consist of the Ṭabaqāt-i-Akbarī, Colonel Jarrat's excellent translation of the Āin-i-Akbarī, and Firishtah's history." But as regards Firishtah he says that he "is little more than a copyist of Nizām-al-dīn Aḥmad" and yet he has adopted the Shāh Mīrzā of Firishtah in preference to the Shāh Mīr of Nizām-ud-dīn. It may be mentioned that very probably there are MSS. of Firishtah, in which the man is called Shāh Mīr, for Col. Briggs, as remarked above, calls him Shah Meer.

In Jonarāja's Chronicle, already referred to in the preceding note, the name occurs in line 137 and in different lines further down. It is there written as मरुमेर, so that Shāh Mīr is in every way more correct than Shāh Mīrzā. I cannot find anything distinct about his being a descendant of Arjuna, but one of his ancestors is called (l. 132) Pārtha who was like another Pārtha (a name of Arjuna) पार्थीन्य इव पार्थः. It is also stated that it had been said there that the descendants of Kuru Śāha would rule the empire of Kashmīr (l. 135).

<sup>2</sup> The ancestry given in the text is given with slight differences in Firishtah and also by Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 452); but the latter in a footnote says "it is surprising that a person of Firishtah's sagacity should have overlooked the evident absurdity of the pedigree." The Cambridge History of India, page 277, describes him as "an adventurer from Swāt"; and Firishtah says he came in the dress of a *faqīr*. In the text-edition بن ال شاشب has been retained between بن کرشاشب and طاغرال .





prayers read and the coins struck in his own name, gave himself the title of Sultān Shams-ud-din. As the commencement of the appearance of the Hanafī religion in the country of Kashmīr was from his time, the beginning of the section about Kashmīr has been made from that time.

### <sup>1</sup> AN ACCOUNT OF SULTĀN SHAMS-UD-DIN.

In short, when Sultān Shams-ud-din attained to sovereignty, he discontinued all <sup>2</sup> the customs of oppression and tyranny, which had continued from preceding ruler. Having assured his mind from (the attempts of) the enemy, he rebuilt anew the whole kingdom of Kashmīr, which had been devastated by slaughter and rapine of <sup>3</sup> Diljū; and gave a written assurance to the *ra'iyats* that he would not take from them a larger revenue than <sup>4</sup> the sixth part of the produce.

Verses:

The standard of the *Bādshāh*, the cherisher of the faith,  
Cast its mighty shadow over all the world:  
The messengers of the sky conveyed  
The news of his justice to countries all.  
The body of disturbance became weak and thin,  
The house of oppression into ruin fell.

As the acclamation of the bravery and the good name of Sultān Shams-ud-din became noised about in all directions, he occupied himself in the work of the government according to the rites of the parties,

<sup>1</sup> The heading in the text is that of one MS. The other MS. omits the heading altogether. The lith. ed. inserts ذکر حکومت after ذکر.

<sup>2</sup> Firishtah and Col. Briggs agree generally. The Cambridge History of India (p. 277) is rather eloquent about the atrocities and tyranny of the Hindu rulers. They were very probably bad enough, but the Cambridge History of India does not give any authority for its diatribe; and is altogether silent about the plunder and slaughter by Diljū which was the chief cause of the exactions and tyranny of the Rājās.

<sup>3</sup> Like the *Ṭabaqāt* Firishtah calls him the *Mīr Bakhshī* (or pay-master general) of Qandahār, but Col. Briggs calls him the chief of Kashghar. He is called Daljū in the *Āin-i-Akbarī* (Jarrat, vol. II. p. 387, note 1) and Zuljū by Rodgers (*J.A.S.B.*, vol. LIV, p. 98).

<sup>4</sup> The *Ṣaṣṭharmśa* of the ancient Hindu kings.

and seized a body of the ʿAlān tribe who had become hostile to him in Kishtwār and meted out punishment to them.

They say that Diljū was the *Mir Bakḥshī* (pay-master general) of Qandahār. He came with all the army to Kashmīr, and turned the whole of the country upside down; and Rāja Sirdēv, having collected a large sum of money as assessment from his subjects, sent it as a tribute to Diljū; and then secluded himself in a corner; and this ruined the entire country of Kashmīr. And as Diljū could not stay there owing to excessive cold, he returned to Qandahār.

After he had acquired stability and firmness, he left all affairs to Jamālīd and ʿAlī Shēr, his two sons, and occupied himself with repose and worship, and then he passed away. The period of his reign was three years.

I find that the Chaks were called the Cakras or Cakras in the Kashmīr Chronicles. Kāḡī Chak, who was the first of Chaks to rise to some eminence, was mentioned as Kūfīnam Cakraḡa and elsewhere Kūca Cakra. I am not so sure about the name of the Mākris in the Chronicles but they were probably the *Margās*.

<sup>3</sup> One MS. omits the name Sulṭān Shams-ud-dīn.

acted jointly with him in all affairs. In fact, the two were always trying to effect the destruction of each other. When Jamshīd's soldiers collected round 'Alī Shēr, and raising him on the throne sat down at <sup>1</sup> Walīpūr, which is a famous city, Jamshīd marched against them with his army and summoned them in the first instance with mildness and courtesy, and tried to have an amicable settlement. 'Alī Shēr turning his head from the proposals of peace, marched on wings of speed, and made a night attack on Jamshīd's army, and defeated it. When Sultān Jamshīd after suffering the defeat, heard that Walīpūr was unoccupied (by 'Alī Shēr's troops), he, with the intention of devastating it, advanced towards it. 'Alī Shēr's soldiers, who had orders to guard and defend it, met him in battle; but most of them were slain. In the meantime, when 'Alī Shēr, <sup>2</sup> after his victory arrived in those parts, Sultān Jamshīd seeing, that he had not the strength to meet him, fled to the country of <sup>3</sup> Kamrāj; and

<sup>1</sup> The name cannot be made out distinctly in either the MS. or in the lith. ed.: but appears to be *ولی پور* Walīpūr or *وانی پور* Wanīpūr. Firishtah lith. ed. has Madnīpūr: and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 455) has Mednypoor; but I cannot find either Walīpūr or Mednīpūr as the name of any well-known city in Kashmīr. Probably Uṣṭalaspura is meant (see Jonarāja, l. 323), or Avantīpura (see Stein's *Rājatarāṅgīnī*, vol. II p. 460). In the text-edition M. Hidayat Ḥosain has *دنی پور* Danīpūr.

<sup>2</sup> Both MSS. have *فتحه نموده*, and I have adopted it; but the lith. ed. has *بفتح و قیروزی خود*.

<sup>3</sup> The MSS. and the lith. ed. have *کراج*. Firishtah has *کمراج*; and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 455) has Gujraj. I find Kamrāj and Kamrāz mentioned in Stein's *Rājatarāṅgīnī*. Kamrāj, is Abū-l-Faḥl's Western half of the Kingdom (pp. 436, 494) and Kamrāz or the territorial division the old Kramarājya and consisting of 18 *parganas* (p. 494).

Madava Rājya I find is written in Sanskrit as *मदव-राज्य*. It appears that according to the general prevailing notion Maraz comprises the districts on both sides of the Vitastā above Srinagar, and Kamrāj those below. In Akbar's time the old *parganas* of Uttar Lolau Hamal and Mach'pur were embodied in the *tauzī pargana* of Kamrāj (see Jarraṭ's *Āin-i-Albarī*, vol. II, p. 371). In Moorcraft's and Baron Hügel's list, the *pargana* Kamrāj includes Uttar Hamal and Mach'pur. Owing to frequent changes of *pargana* divisions, the extent of the *pargana* Kamrāj has also varied from time to time (vide Stein's *Rājatarāṅgīnī*, vol. II p. 436, note 2). I have inserted Kamrāj in the text instead of Karāj. Haig does not mention Kamrāj either in the Cambridge History of India or in his paper in the *J.R.A.S.*, vol. L (1915).

his *vazīr* Sirāj, who had the defence of Srinagar in his charge, summoned 'Alī Shēr from the city of <sup>1</sup> Uchh and made Srinagar over to him. Jamshīd, after this catastrophe <sup>2</sup> did not again gird up his loins; and after ruling for <sup>3</sup> one year and two months passed away.

#### <sup>4</sup> AN ACCOUNT OF SULTĀN 'ALĀ'-UD-DIN.

When Sultān Jamshīd passed away, his <sup>5</sup> younger brother, who had the name of 'Alī Shēr, assumed the title of Sultān 'Alā'-ud-din and sat on the throne. He conferred full powers on his younger brother Shēr Āshāmak. In the beginning of his reign there was great plenty; <sup>6</sup> but towards the end there was a great famine, and an immense number of people perished. <sup>7</sup> He got hold of a body of Rasturīs, who had become hostile to him and had gone away to Kishtawār, by various devices, and bringing them into Kashmīr imprisoned them. He raised the standard of his power and laid the foundation of <sup>8</sup> a city, which he called after his own name, near Yehīyypūr. Among the rules

---



promulgated by him was one, that an unchaste woman should <sup>1</sup> not inherit her husband's property.

The period of his rule was <sup>2</sup> twelve years and eight months and thirteen days.

AN ACCOUNT OF SULTĀN <sup>3</sup> SHIHĀB-UD-DĪN, SON OF SULTĀN  
SHĀMS-UD-DĪN.

When Sultān 'Alā'-ud-dīn had traversed the stages of life, his younger brother, who had the name of Shēr Āshūmak attained to the *saltanat* after him. He was a man of resolution and bravery, and had pleasant manners and morals. <sup>4</sup> Any day on which a report of a victory did not come from some direction, that day he did not <sup>5</sup> count as one of the days in his life, and on such a day marks of pain appeared on his <sup>6</sup> countenance. He made over the demarcated country to the old *mālik*s (owners); and marched with his army to the banks of the river Sind. <sup>7</sup> They say that when the ruler of that country came and

<sup>1</sup> Both the MSS. have ارث نبرد. The lith. ed. has ارث نگیرد. This is better and I have retained it.

<sup>2</sup> This agrees with Jonarāja (l. 359).

<sup>3</sup> He is called शिवायदीन by Jonarāja, so that whatever the correct pronunciation of the name might be there can be no doubt as to what he was called. *Shirasana*, as has been pointed out, means a little milk-drinker, and was probably a childish nickname.

<sup>4</sup> This fact is mentioned even more emphatically by Jonarāja, who says that any moment in which he did not gain a victory he counted as lost for nothing, and who further expatiates on his ambition for victory, and his numerous expeditions, which were as dear to him as a young wife is to an old man, and which neither cold nor heat nor evening nor night nor hunger nor thirst could interfere with. Neither a fawn-eyed fair one, nor the pleasures of wine nor the moonlight could charn his mind like a military expedition. No river was difficult to cross, nor any mountain difficult to climb nor any desert impossible to traverse (lines 365 to 368).

<sup>5</sup> دانست in the text-edition.

<sup>6</sup> The word is بشرة which means the outer skin, the surface, and also humanity and constitution. Probably the word complexion would best express the meaning.

<sup>7</sup> According to Jonarāja his first expedition was towards the north, and he entered Udabhāṇḍapura (Waihand or Und) on the Indus, the capital of Gandhāra (l. 372, etc.). It appears to me that when Nizām-ud-dīn and Firishlah speak of the residents of Qandahār being in terror of him they refer

engaged him in battle, he was defeated; and the residents of Qandahār and Ghaznī were always in terror of him. He marched as far as <sup>1</sup> Āshnagar, which is now known as <sup>2</sup> Āshnagar and <sup>3</sup> Peshāwar; and slew an immense number of his enemies. He had gone as far as the <sup>4</sup> foot-hills of the Hindūkush, (but) on account of the hardships of the road, he, after undergoing much privations, returned. He then made an encampment on the bank of the river Sutlej. The Rājā of <sup>5</sup> Nagarkōt, who had ravaged some of the estates appertaining to Dehli, and was returning, rendered homage to the Sultān on the way; and having surrendered to him the whole of the vast quantity of the booty which he had seized, made his submission to him. The ruler of <sup>6</sup> Tibet also waited on him, and prayed that the Sultān's army might not cause any injury to his territories.

After he had conquered all the surrounding countries he took up his abode in his capital. He made his younger brother, whose name

not to the present Qandahār, which was far away. As Udabhāṇḍapura was the capital of Gandhāra, they may very well have called it Qandahār. The ruler of Sindhu (Sind) gave his daughter in marriage to him (l. 374). In line 377 Gajinīpurī (Ghaznī) is mentioned as being frightened on hearing the lion-like roars of the lion-king's army. Then he marched southwards and refreshed his tired horses by (bathing them in the cooling) waters of the *Satadrū* or Sutlej (l. 382).

<sup>1</sup> The name looks like *اشت نکر* and *باشت نکر* in the MSS. and the lith. ed. has *شب نکر*. Firishtah lith. ed. has *اسپ نکر* and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 458) has Ashnuggur.

<sup>2</sup> The name here looks like *هاش نعر* and *باش نعر* in the MSS., and *باش نعر* in the lith. ed. The lith. ed. of Firishtah has *اش نعر*. Col. Briggs does not give the more recent name. I have not been able to identify the place.

<sup>3</sup> The name is written as *پرشاردر* and *بشاردر* in the MSS., and as *پرشاردر* in the lith. ed.

<sup>4</sup> I have not been able to find anything about his marching to the Hindūkush mountains in Jonarāja.

<sup>5</sup> The encounter with the Rājā of Nagarkōt appears to be referred to in the somewhat curious lines (383, etc.) according to which the Rājā Udakpati is said to have pillaged Dhillī (दिल्ली), which may be a misprint for दिल्ली, but I have not been able to find any account anywhere in Jonarāja of Rājā Udakpati or any connection between him and Nagarkōt.

<sup>6</sup> The MSS. have *طبت*, and *تبت* and the lith. ed. has *طبلت*. Firishtah has *تبت کوچک*, little Tibet.

was Hindāl, his heir; and he banished <sup>1</sup> Hasan and his brother, who were both his legitimate sons, towards Dehli, at the dictation of another wife of his who had ill-feeling with their mother.

He founded two cities called <sup>2</sup> Lachminagar and Shihābpūr; and then passed away.

The period of his rule was twenty years.

### <sup>3</sup> AN ACCOUNT OF SULTĀN QUTB-UD-DIN, SON OF SHAMS-UD-DIN.

When Sultān Shihāb-ud-din rolled up the bed of his life, his brother, who was named Hindāl, succeeded him on the throne. He was possessed of pleasant manners and morals; and made very good arrangements for compliance of his orders. He sent a <sup>4</sup> *sardār* of the name of Loār for the conquest of the fort of Loharkōt, which was in the possession of some of the *amīrs* of Sultān Shihāb-ud-din. After several great battle had taken place between the two sides, the *sardār*

<sup>1</sup> Firishtah calls them Hasan Khān and 'Alī Khān. There is no mention anywhere, of the reason for their banishment. Jonarāja (L. 438) says:

रागी तदोपवादिन्या तया देवा प्रदीक्षितः ।

ध्वानयन् रुदेमान् न राजपुत्रान् परानिव ।

<sup>2</sup> I cannot find anything about Lachminagar or Shihābpūr: in the text-edition the former is لجمی *Lajminagar*.

<sup>3</sup> The heading in both MSS. is as I have in the text. The heading in the lith. ed. is ذکر حکومت منذال بن شمس الدین. The name Qutb-ud-din has been transformed by Jonarāja to कृष्णदीन, Kumbhadina (L. 462).

<sup>4</sup> The readings here are somewhat different and obscure. One MS. has لواری نام سرداری را. This I consider the best reading and have adopted it. The other MS. has بوداو نام سرداری را and the lith. ed. has سرداری را (indistinct). Firishtah lith. ed. has در آخر سلطنت سرداری را which cannot be correct, as this is stated in the beginning of the account of the reign. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 460) following Firishtah says, "In the latter part of his reign he deputed an officer." The Cambridge History of India, page 278, says, "A rebellion of some of his predecessor's officers obliged him to send an expedition which was successful for the recovery of the fortress of Lokarkot." I can find no authority for the statement that the expedition was successful. Both the Ṭabaqāt and Firishtah say that the commander sent by Qutb-ud-din was slain.

As to the position, etc. of the fort of Loharkōt (Loharakoṭṭa) or the castle of Lohara which the expedition was sent to conquer, see *Rājatarāṅgiṇī*, vol. II, p. 293. بوداو Būdāo is the name of the *sardār* in the text-edition.

was slain. And he sent for his nephew Ḥasan, son of Ṣhihāb-ud-dīn, from Dehli; and wanted to make him his heir and successor; but envious people made him repent of this decision and incited him <sup>1</sup> to seize him. One of the *amīrs* of the Sultān, who was named <sup>2</sup> Rāy Rāwal, informed Ḥasan of this; and <sup>3</sup> he fled to Loharkōṭ with Ḥasan by way of Kāshmīr. After that the *zamīndārs* seized both of them; and sent them to the Sultān. Rāy Rāwal was executed, and Ḥasan was cast into prison.

In the later years of his life two sons were born to the Sultān. One was called <sup>4</sup> Sikār and the other Haibat Khān. Both these sons were young when the Sultān <sup>5</sup> passed away from the world.

The period of his rule was fifteen years and five months.

<sup>1</sup> One MS. and the lith. ed. have *بر گرفتن او* to seize him; but the other MS. has *بر کشتن او* to slay him, which appears to be a mistake; this, however, has been adopted in the text-edition.

<sup>2</sup> The name is written as *رای راول* in one MS. In the other MS. and in the lith. ed. it is *روی راول*. Firishtah lith. ed. has by mistake *رای ول را*. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 460) has Ray Rawul. The Cambridge History of India, page 278, does not mention his name, but calls him a Hindu courtier. Both Nizām-ud-dīn and Firishtah say that the Sultān attempted to seize Ḥasan at the instigation of envious people. Col. Briggs (*loc. cit.*), however, says, "He became so popular as to excite the King's jealousy"; while the Cambridge History of India says his "impatience exceeded his gratitude, and he conspired with a Hindu courtier against his patron."

<sup>3</sup> There are slight differences in the readings. One MS. and the lith. ed. have *و با حسن از راه کشمیر فرار شده بلوهر کوٹ رفت*. With this difference that the lith. ed. has *نموده* in place of *شده*; this is adopted in the text-edition. The other MS. omits the first word, from which it would appear that Ḥasan alone fled to Loharkōṭ, but this is not correct as this MS. as well as the other and the lith. ed. also say that the *zamīndārs* seized both of them and sent them to the Sultān.

<sup>4</sup> The name is *سکار*, and *سیکار* in the MSS. and *سکا* in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has *شکار*. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 461) has Sugga and the Cambridge History of India, page 279, Sakār or Sankār. It appears from Jonarāja, line 531, that he was called Śrīṅgāra and (not Sikandar, as suggested by Haig on p. 454 of the *J.R.A.S.*, vol. L, 1918), of which Sikar, etc., are corruptions. The other was named Haibat Khān according to the MS., etc.; and Haibata according to Jonarāja, line 533.

<sup>5</sup> Firishtah lith. ed. gives 796 A.H., as the year of his death, while Col. Briggs has 799 A.H., 1396 A.D. The Cambridge History of India, page 279,

1AN ACCOUNT OF SULTĀN SIKANDAR, THE ICONOCLAST, THE SON OF  
QUTB-UD-DIN, THE SON OF SHAMS-UD-DIN, WHO HAD THE NAME  
OF SIKĀR.

In concert with the *vazīrs* and *amīrs* he sat in his father's place; and <sup>2</sup> taking up the management of affairs into his own hands,

has 1394. Firishtah also says that Mir Saiyid 'Alī Hamadānī came to Srinagar in the reign of Qutb-ud-din; was received with great honour and respect; and many people of the country became his true disciples. Firishtah also says that, according to Mirza Haidar Dughlat's book, he remained in Kashmir for a little more than forty days, and then went back to his cherished native place: but Firishtah thinks that the great *Khānqā*, which was built by him in Srinagar, could not have been completed in forty days, and, therefore, if he remained there for only forty days its foundations alone might have been laid down in his presence and it must have been completed after his departure.

The statement of Firishtah about Mir Saiyid 'Alī Hamadānī's stay does not appear to be correct. From the *Tarikh-i-Rashidi* (Elias & Denison Ross, 1895, pp. 432, 433) it appears, that he was expelled from Persia by Timur and it appears from Mr. Beale's account (*Oriental Biog. Dictionary*, p. 238) that he came with seven hundred Saiyids to Kashmir in 1380, and died in Pakhlī in 1386. Mirza Haider Dughlat in the *Tarikh-i-Rashidi*, however, says that Kutb-ud-din died in less than forty days, which is somewhat ambiguous, but which really probably means that he died less than forty days after the arrival of the Saiyid.

<sup>1</sup> The heading in the MSS. is as I have in the text. That in the lith. ed. is different; it is ذکر حکومت سلطان سکندر کہ سکا نام داشت. The Sanskritised form of the name as given by Jonarāja is गेकस्वर (l. 539).

<sup>2</sup> According to Firishtah, however, Sikandar's mother acted as the regent in the early part of his reign. I cannot find the mother's name in the lith. ed. of Firishtah, but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 462) calls her Soorut Rany, and the Cambridge History of India, page 279, Sūra. According to Jonarāja, however, see lines 539, 543, her correct name appears to have been Subhaṭā or Śobhā. She is called Subhaṭā Devī or Śrī Śobhā Mahādevī. She appears to have been an extremely stern, if not a cruel woman: for finding that her son-in-law Muhammad Shāh (called सद्धपुत्र सद्धमद in l. 540 in Jonarāja), was against her son, she caused him and his wife, her own daughter, to be murdered. At her instigation also, probably Rāy Mādārī, a leading nobleman caused prince Haibat Khān, Sikandar's younger brother, to be poisoned. The name of the nobleman is Rāy Mādārī (with slight variations) in the MSS. and the lith. ed. of the *Ṭabaqāt* and also in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 462) has "the prime minister Ray Makry" and the Cambridge History of India, page 279, has Rāi Mādārī, which however is incorrect, the correct transliteration being Rāy Mādārī. I cannot find any name in Jonarāja which

<sup>1</sup> sent Rāy Mādārī, the *vazīr* who possessed much power to Tibet. He conquered that country, and having collected a large army rebelled against his master. There was a battle in the neighbourhood of <sup>2</sup> Bhimbar; Rāy Mādārī was defeated and captured and thrown into prison, where he killed himself. Immense armies collected round the Sultān, and all the surrounding countries were conquered by him.

At this time, when His Majesty, the Lord of the Conjunctions, Amir Timūr sent <sup>3</sup> an elephant for the Sultān the latter was very

has any resemblance to Rāy Mādārī. There are two ministers mentioned by him called Uddaka and Sāhaka (l. 539); and it was Uddaka who killed Muhammad Shāh and his wife (l. 540), and poisoned Haibat Khān (l. 543), and afterwards killed his colleague Sāhaka (l. 545).

<sup>1</sup> According to Firishtah Sikandar and Rāy Mādārī distrusted each other. Rāy Mādārī, becoming aware of Sikandar's feeling towards him, suggested that he might be allowed to march to conquer little Tibet, his object being that he might in this way be safe from the fire of Sikandar's anger; and Sikandar agreed, as he hoped that Rāy Mādārī might be slain in the war. Accordingly Rāy Mādārī invaded Tibet, and gradually conquered the whole country. Having in this way become very powerful, he rebelled against Sikandar. The latter marched against him and a battle took place near the boundary of the two countries. Rāy Mādārī was defeated and fled, but he later fell into the hand of Sikandar's troops. He was thrown into prison; and after a time killed himself by taking poison. Jonarāja, however, says he cut his own throat निजयैव हृष्याथ स्वगलच्छेदमाचरत्, line 554. روی نادری in the text-edition is apparently a misprint.

<sup>2</sup> The name of the place where the battle took place is written as بنبر Binbar in one MS. In the other it is not very legible but looks like جز سر Jazsar. In the lith. ed. it is written as بنبر. It is not mentioned by Firishtah or any other historians as far as I have seen, except Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 463), who calls it, "the town of Nero". The battle, the flight of Rāy Mādārī or Uddaka and his capture are mentioned by Jonarāja (l. 549 and the following lines), but I cannot discover the name of the place where the battle took place. پینبر in the text-edition.

<sup>3</sup> The MSS. do not give the number of the elephants, they are very imperfect. One has فرستاد فیل برای without any mention of the person for whom it or they were sent. The other is better; it has فرستاد سلطان فیل برای. The lith. ed. has فرستاد فیل برای سلطان, from which it would appear only one elephant was sent. Firishtah however says Timūr sent his emissaries with two elephants. Jonarāja also says that Timūr, whom he describes curiously enough as चैकराज,

proud of this fact, and sent a petition to the Lord of the Conjunctions, containing expressions of his devotion and service. He also wrote that he would wait upon His Majesty, whenever he might be ordered to do so. He sent back the ambassadors after showing them very great favours. When (the expression of) the relation of this attachment and service was reported to the Lord of the Conjunctions, the latter declared his friendship for him, and sent a robe of honour of gold embroidery with a horse and a jewelled saddle; and ordered

---

sent two elephants to the King of Kashmīr, being afraid of the latter. The whole passage (lines 559, 560) is so curious that I have thought it best to quote it :

तदैव दीनाभरणामपालकतया युताम् ।

शेखराजो बध्नात् दिल्लीं विध्वामिव कुण्डयन् ॥

ततः प्रत्याव्रजन् शेखराजः कश्मीरभूपतेः ।

शङ्कमानो गजेन्द्रौ हावुपायनसचीकरत् ॥

In another place Dehli was spelt as दिल्ली and here it is spelt as दिल्ली; and the comparison of Dehli with a widow, who being without a ruler had only poor and wretched ornaments; and a great world-conquerer Timūr being afraid of the King of Kashmīr are extremely curious. I have looked in Jonarāja for further references to Timūr but have not been able to find them.

Firishtah and Col. Briggs's account of the correspondence between Timūr and Sultān Sikandar agrees with that in the text; but they increase the amount of the tribute, which Timūr's *vazīrs* had stated would be required, to three thousand horses and one hundred thousand '*Alāi ashrafīs*. The Cambridge History of India, page 279, does not say that Timūr sent any elephant to Sikandar; but it says (following the *Zafarnāma*) that his grandson Rustam and Mu'tamad Zain-ud-din who had been sent to Sikandar from Dehli as envoys (with what object does not appear) arrived and joined Timūr's camp near Jammū. They reported that they had been well received, and had been sent back with Maulānā Nūr-ud-din as the envoy of Sikandar. The latter was informed by Timūr's courtiers that Sikandar would be required to send thirty thousand horses and one hundred thousand golden *Dirhams*. This is perfectly correct, but the *Zafarnāma* does not use the word *Dirham* but the words صد هزار درمست زر. It is difficult to say which of these various accounts is correct. It may be noted that it is said in the *Āin-i-Akbarī* (Jarrat, vol. II, p. 387) that Sikandar on his way to Taimūr's camp, heard that it was reported in the camp, that he was bringing a present of a thousand horses; and concerned at the untruthfulness of this report he went back and sent his excuses. In Rodger's account (*J.A.S.B.*, vol. LIV, p. 101) it is said that Sikandar was informed by some of Taimūr's servants, that he must give at least three thousand horses and one hundred thousand *ashrafīs*.

that when the great standard should return from Dehli towards the Punjāb, he should come and wait upon him. In accordance with this order, Sultān Sikandar started with much tribute to attend on him when His Majesty was advancing towards the Punjāb from the Siwālik hills. On the way he heard that some of the *amīrs* of the Lord of the Conjunctions had said, that it was proper that Sultān Sikandar should bring a thousand horses as his tribute. The Sultān became distressed in his mind on hearing this news, and turned back and sent a petition, that as a tribute fit for the offering had not been got together, his departure has been postponed for a few days. His Majesty, on becoming aware of the circumstances, reprimanded the men who had said that Sultān Sikandar should present a thousand horses as a tribute; and having shown favour to the emissaries of Sultān Sikandar told them that the *vazīrs* had made an altogether unreasonable demand, and the Sultān should come and wait upon His Majesty without any anxiety. When the Sultān heard this news from the ambassadors he came out of Kashmir with great pleasure with the determination to wait on His Majesty; but when he passed Bāramūla, he heard that His Majesty the Lord of the Conjunctions had crossed the river Sind, and had proceeded towards Samarqand. He then sent his ambassadors with much tribute to wait upon His Majesty, and turned back towards Kashmir.

And as he was extremely liberal, the learned men of 'Irāq and Khurāsān and Māwarā'-un-nahr came with hopeful faces to his threshold; and the Islāmic religion became prevalent in Kashmir.

#### Verses:

His noble spirit such generosity proclaimed  
That even to the hopeless despair forbidden became.  
When Islām such resplendence gained  
His door the sacred shrine of high and low became.

Among the learned men he showed very great honour, to <sup>1</sup> Saiyyid Muḥammad, who was the chief of the wise men (of the age); and

---

<sup>1</sup> It is not quite clear who this man was. Was he Mīr Muḥammad the son of Saiyyid Ali Hamadāni, who led a batch of five hundred Saiyyids into



made complete arrangement for breaking images and pulling down the temples of the *Kōfirs*. Among the temples there was a great one at <sup>1</sup> Bahrārah, which was dedicated to Mahādēv. The Sultān had it demolished. Although they dug under it, and went down up to the water, they could not find its end. They also pulled down another temple which was at <sup>2</sup> Jakdar, and (when they did so) great flames burst out, which the Sultān (himself) saw. (It is said that) <sup>3</sup> Rāja Lalitādat Devharah had built it outside the sacred city

Kashmir in 1381, following his father who had led seven hundred the year before after the expulsion of the Sayyids by Timur? (See note 2, p. 432 of *Tarikh-i-Rashidī* by Elias & Denison Ross).

<sup>1</sup> The MSS. have باہرارہ Bahrārah, and بجوارہ Bajwārah, and the lith. ed. has حوارہ without any dots so that they may be many different names. Firishtah lith. ed. has باغ بھر آرا and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 465) has Punjhzara. There is a great deal in Jonarāja about the breaking of images, but I have not been able to find any mention of the demolition of the temples.

<sup>2</sup> The MSS. have جکدر Jakdar and the lith. ed. has جکت Jakat. Firishtah lith. ed. has اورا کے جگہ دیو بدو which Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 465) has translated, "the temple dedicated to Jug Dew". According to the *Āin-i-Albārī* (Jarrat, vol. II, p. 364, note 3), this temple was at Parihāsapura, pronounced by the Kashmiris as Poruspūr. It was the ancient Parihāsapura which was built by Lalitāditya who reigned A.D. 723-760. It was, writes General Cunningham, situated on the river bank of the Jhelum near the present village of Sumbal." The Cambridge History of India does not give the name of the temple. سن پور Sanpūr is the name of the place in the text-edition.

<sup>3</sup> The name is written as الملكات in the MS. and الهات in the lith. ed. Firishtah also has الملكات. Col. Briggs has "Raja Bulnat"; and Mr. Rodgers (*J.A.S.B.*, vol. LIV, p. 101) has Lilitāwat. The king referred to may be Lalitāditya Muktapīḍa, who according to the Chinese Annals of the T'ang Dynasty sent an embassy to China in the reign of the Hsien Tsiang, A.D. 713-755. He did not live 1,100 years before the Iconoclast 1393-1450 A.D., but his name is the nearest I can get to Lilitāwat. Firishtah lith. ed. in the corresponding passage has راجہ الملكات پیش از ظہور اسلام دیو بدو در غایت عظمت و استحکام در ترس پور ساخته بود. This does not throw much light on the matter except for the similarities of the name of the Rājā to that of Lalitāditya. The name Taraspūr is apparently a mistake for Paraspūr or Parihāsapura (see end of the preceding note).

of Dārāpūr; and had learnt from astrologers, that after one thousand and one hundred years, a *Bādshāh* of the name of Sikandar would demolish it and would break up the image of Mercury, which was in it. This matter he had caused to be engraved on a plate of copper, which he had put into a casket and had caused it to be buried under the edifice. At the time of demolishing it the inscription was discovered. The Sultān said, "Would that they had left this inscription on the face of the building, so that I should not have issued the order for its demolition." <sup>1</sup> All spirituous liquors and duties were entirely abolished in his kingdom.

In his old age he suffered from a burning fever. He sent for <sup>2</sup> Mirān Khān, Shāhī Khān and Muḥammad Khān who were his three sons, and gave them testamentary directions. He conferred the title of 'Alī Shāh on Mirān Khān and bestowed the kingdom on him.

The period of his rule was twenty-two years and nine months and six days.

<sup>1</sup> The MSS. have شراب و تمغا. The lith. ed. has و شراب قطعاً which is incorrect. Firishtah lith. ed. has و از ولايت او از هيچكس خواه گانر و خواه مسلمان. تمغا نگيرند. It was natural that as zealous, not to say a bigoted Musalmān, Sultān Sikandar should have gone in for a dry Kashmīr, but his reason for the abolition of the *Tamaghā* cannot be so easily understood; nor the exact nature of the tax which he abolished. Col. Briggs translates *Tamaghā* as export duties. The Cambridge History of India does not mention the prohibition of the use of spirituous liquor, or the abolition of the *Tamaghā*; Rodgers (*J.A.S.B.*, vol. LIV, p. 102) mentions that Sikandar prohibited the use of wine but says nothing of the abolition of the *Tamaghā*. The word, as I have said elsewhere, means a stand or a seat; and I suppose it came to mean a tax because the payment of taxes was denoted by the affixing of a stamp.

<sup>2</sup> The names of the sons are as I have them in the text in the MSS. as well as in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has Mir Khān as the name of the eldest, but the names of the other two are as in the *Ṭabaqāt*. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 466) has Ameer Khan and Shady Khan as the names of the two elder sons. The Cambridge History of India, page 280, has Nūr Khān as the name of the eldest, and Shāhī Khān of the second. Jonarāja, line 584, gives the names मेरखान, शाहिखान and मदनदखान and they are described as प्रत्यक्षा द्व धर्मार्थकासाः काम-सनोरसाः; and their mother is called मेरदेवी (l. 585); so Mir Khān of Firishtah appears to be correct. He appears to have had another son called पिरुज, Piruja or Firūz by another queen Śobhā Devī (l. 586).

<sup>1</sup> AN ACCOUNT OF SULTĀN 'ALĪ SHĀH, SON OF SULTĀN SIKANDAR BUTSHIKAN, WHO HAD THE NAME OF MIRĀN KHĀN.

In spite of the fact that he was young,<sup>2</sup> his greatness and an awe of him having found place in men's hearts, the people of the country were obedient to him. In the early years he left the management of affairs to <sup>3</sup> Siyah Bhat, who having become a Musalmān had been the *vazīr* of Sultān Sikandar. During the period of four years in which he was the *vazīr*, he perpetrated various kinds of oppressions and tyranny on the people. Most of the Hindūs left the country, and some killed themselves. When Siyah Bhat died of a <sup>4</sup> hectic fever, the Sultān selected his younger brother Shāhī Khān, who was famous for his bravery and intelligence, for the post of *vazīr*; and the latter took charge of all affairs. After that the Sultān made <sup>5</sup> Shāhī Khān his *locum tenens* and directing his <sup>6</sup> younger brother Muhammad Khān to obey him, left Kashmīr with the object of <sup>7</sup> travelling about; and went to the Rāja of Jammū, who was his father-in-law.

<sup>1</sup> The headings are slightly different in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. One MS. omits the word *Butshikan*. The lith. ed. inserts the word حکومت before the name of Sultān 'Alī Shāh. One MS. omits the *که* before Mirān Khān. The lith. ed. substitutes *واو* for *که*. In the text-edition the heading ends with *مکندر بیت شکن*.

<sup>2</sup> According to Firishtah the grandeur was of Sultān Sikandar, and the awe was felt for him, and not for the young prince.

<sup>3</sup> The name is *مده بہت* and *مده بہت* in the MS. and *مده بہت* in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has *مده بہت*. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 467) has Seera Dew Bhut. Rodgers (*J.A.S.B.*, vol. LIV, p. 103) has Syah But; and the Cambridge History of India, page 280, has Sinha Bhat.

<sup>4</sup> In the text-edition he is stated to have died of *مرضی دق* or tuberculosis.

<sup>5</sup> One MS. rather unnecessarily and tautologically inserts *کہ بشجاعت موصوم* *بید*.

<sup>6</sup> One MS. has *برادر خورد تر را*.

<sup>7</sup> The MSS. as well as the lith. ed. have *برسر راجہ جمو کہ خسر او بید رفت*. Firishtah explains further by saying that he went to the Rāja of Jammū to bid him farewell *برای وداع*. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 467) has "of travelling in foreign countries". In all these there is no mention of a pilgrimage; but the *Āin-i-Akhbari*, Jarrat, vol. II, page 387, says that 'Alī Shāh set out for Hījāz; and Haig (*J.R.A.S.*, vol. L, 1918, p. 455) says he "resolved to perform the pilgrimage to Makkah"; and the Cambridge History of India,

At this time some interested persons made him repentant of his having made Shāhī Khān his successor. The Rājās of Jammū and Rājaurī, having gone to support 'Alī Shāh, he again brought Kashmir into his possession, Shāhī Khān retired from Kashmir to Siālkōt. During this time Jasrat Khōkhar, who had been seized by the Lord of the Conjunctions (Timūr), but after His Majesty's death had fled

page 280, says, desired "in an access of religious zeal to perform the pilgrimage to Mecca." Jonarāja also supports this, for although Mecca or Hījāz is not specifically mentioned, the anxiety of 'Alī Shāh for तीर्थानुसरण, and तीर्थार्थमुत्कण्ठा are mentioned in lines 693 and 699; and in line 704 it is said निर्बन्धनेति जल्पन् च तीर्थार्थं धरणीपतिः। युवराजं हठाद्राज्यभारमग्राहयच्चिरात्। His enthusiasm for pilgrimage, however, appears to have been very short-lived, for it appears from line 708 that the privations and the probable small result of the pilgrimage soon removed all his enthusiasm for it and the king of Madra (Jammū) took him back to Kashmir (l. 710). The new king Shāhī Khān was displeased at his brother's return: and followed by the *phākurs* he went away from Kashmir (l. 714). Then we come to Jasrat called Jasratha by Jonarāja (l. 730). And in line 734, we read of the march of 'Alī Shāh against Jasrat, but it is said that his enterprise was censured by his army, which was astonished at his own poverty. Afterwards when he came to a place called Mudgaravyāla, (l. 738), a messenger came from the Rājā of Madra telling him not to begin the war with the Khokhars, although there were great warriors in his army, as he (the Madrarāja) alone knew the दुःखुराणां रणच्छलम्. Then 'Alī Shāh was defeated. There is no mention, however, of *Kabandhas* or headless bodies. Zain-ul-'ābidīn (जैजैनोद्दामदीन) entered first the hearts of the inhabitants and then the capital. पीराणां प्राक् मनः पश्चाद्राजधानीं दृपोविशत् (l. 751).

As to the general history of 'Alī Shāh's reign Firishtah agrees generally with the Tabaqāt, but he says that the Rājā of Jammū and Rājaurī reproved 'Alī Shāh about his making Shāhī Khān his heir, and he repented of what he had done; and they sent troops with him to attack Shāhī Khān. The latter went to Siālkōt, and sought the help of Jasrat Shaikha Khokhar. Then there was a battle. There is no mention of any headless body. 'Alī Shāh was defeated, as his troops were fatigued after the long, rapid march, and the enemy did not give them any time to rest and recover. As to 'Alī Shāh Firishtah says that according to one account, he fell alive in Jasrat's hands, and according to another, Shāhī Khān pursued him, and drove him out of the kingdom.

The Cambridge History of India, page 280, adds nothing new; but according to it, the final battle took place near the Tattakutī pass. I have not been able to find anything about this pass. There is a Tatakulī pass, which is almost due east to the entrance of the Lohara Valley, but it cannot be identified with the Tattakutī pass.

from Samarqand, coming to the Punjāb had acquired great power. Shāhī Khān joined <sup>1</sup> Jasrat Khōkhar and having obtained reinforcements from him, brought them to attack 'Alī Shāh. The latter advanced against Jasrat with an immense army, and a great battle took place and many were killed on both sides. They say that certain headless bodies had risen up and had moved about in the battlefield. It is a fixed belief among the Indians, that in any battle, in which ten thousand are slain, a headless body, which is called the *Kabandh* in <sup>2</sup> Hindi, rises and moves about. In the end 'Alī Shāh having no strength (to continue the fight) fled; and Shāhī Khān entered Kashmir in pursuit of him. The men in the city rejoiced at his coming.

The period of the rule of 'Alī Shāh was six years and nine months

<sup>3</sup> AN ACCOUNT OF SULTĀN ZAIN-UL-'ĀBIDĪN, SON OF SULTĀN SIKANDAR BUTSHIKAN, WHICH IS ANOTHER NAME FOR SHĀHĪ KHĀN

Sultān Zain-ul-'ābidīn, after his brother sought a place on the throne of the empire. <sup>4</sup> Jasrat Khōkhar aided by the Sultān's power brought the whole of the Punjāb into his possession, although he could not conquer Dehli. Tibet and the whole country which is situated on the bank of the river Sind came into the Sultān's possession. <sup>5</sup> He made Muḥammad Khān, his younger brother, a councillor and left the decision of all affairs to his judgement. He himself took great pains for ascertaining the truth in all cases and disputes. He cultivated the society of all classes. He had acquired much learning and skill in arts; and in his assemblies men of intellect, both Hindūs

<sup>1</sup> جورت in the text-edition here is apparently a mis-print for جورت.

<sup>2</sup> One MS. has مندی and the other has مندوی. The lith. ed. has neither the one nor the other. کیندہ Kēndah in the text-edition.

<sup>3</sup> The name of Zain-ul-'ābidīn appears to have been too much for the writers of the MSS. One calls him Sultān Zain-ud-dīn, and the other Sultān Al-'ābidīn. The lith. ed. has the name correctly, but it inserts the words ذکر حکومت before Sultān Zain-ul-'ābidīn.

<sup>4</sup> The relation between Sultān Zain-ul-'ābidīn and Jasrat is somewhat differently expressed by Jomārāja (l. 760), दमन दम कामन्य भूपतिरभवत् पटः । पुत्रपुरःपिपतिनय्य भलेष्वभ्यधिक्रियः ।

<sup>5</sup> This is rather finely described by Jomārāja, who says : भजे भवः नये भर्ता दिव्यः प्रपतिरये । देवदण्डपालो भव कर्तारिण्य भिदः । (l. 758).

and Musabmāns, were always present. In the science and art of music he had very great skill. No other ruler of Kashmir had the success which he had in settling and increasing the population, in expanding the cultivation, and in excavating canals and water courses.

Couplet :

To every one does not come that with the cloud of his resolution,  
He can keep the young plants of his time verdant and green.

Wherever a robbery took place in his kingdom, there was a mulct or fine fixed from the chief men of that village; and for this reason robberies and thefts became completely unknown. In his time the writing of the rates of the prices of different commodities was ordered. These were engraved on thin copper plates and were left in all cities, <sup>1</sup> to indicate that all customs of tyranny had been rooted out in the kingdom of Kashmir; and (to point out) <sup>2</sup> that whoever came after him and did not act according to his practices, God and he would know (the effect of such conduct).

On the prayer of <sup>3</sup> Sri Bhat, who in the science of medicine was unrivalled in the age, and had received various kinds of favours from

---

the Sultān, other Brahmans, who during the reign of Sultān Sikandar had, on the accusation of Siyah Bhat been banished, came back and took up their quarters in the temples, and places which had been allotted to them; and stipends were granted to them. The Sultān took an agreement from Brahmans, that they would not <sup>1</sup>act in contravention of what was written in their books. After that he revived all their customs, such as the making of sectarian march, and <sup>2</sup>the burning of women with their (dead) husbands, etc., which Sultān Sikandar had abolished.

He also excused the *ra'iyats* from paying all fines <sup>3</sup> and tributes, and all payments of grain (*i.e.*, in kind). He issued an order that merchants bringing commodities from different directions should not hide them; and refraining from all wicked storing (cornering?) should sell them at a small profit. He released all persons who had been imprisoned in previous reigns. <sup>4</sup> He allowed the treasuries of all countries, which were conquered, to be plundered; and assessed the revenue on them on the same scale as that of (the country round) the capital. He chastised the turbulent people, and kept a watch over them according to the necessary standard.

He showed favour to *faqirs* and the aged and helpless; and did not permit that they should perish. He never looked at the face of a strange woman or at another's wealth with an avaricious and dishonest eye. In kindness to the *ra'iyats*, he increased the length of the <sup>5</sup> yard

<sup>1</sup> Both MSS. have نقل نکنند. The lith. ed. has فعل نکنند. The meaning of course as Firishtah has it تخلف نمایند. I do not know that نقل نکردن conveys this meaning; فعل نکردن may do so; but عمل کردن is better. I have, however, retained فعل نکنند. In the text-edition it is نقل نکند.

<sup>2</sup> In this matter Sultān Sikandar was very much ahead of his time. Neither Akbar nor any other emperor ordered this and it was not till Lord William Bontinck's time that the practice of *Sati* was abolished.

<sup>3</sup> This is too vague. All fines were not abolished. As we have seen, the Sultān established one for putting down thefts and robberies. Firishtah is a little more definite. According to him پیشکش و جرمانه و دیگر مصادرات که شداداران از رعایای گرفتند بر انداخت. Even this is not precise; but if Firishtah is correct, it was the fines, etc., imposed by the provincial governors which were abolished.

<sup>4</sup> The meaning of this is obscure. Firishtah makes it clear by saying که انرا بر عساکر قسمت می نمود, that is, he distributed it among the troops.

<sup>5</sup> Only چریب in the text-edition.

measure and of the chain beyond what had been customary. The necessary amounts for the Sultān's household expenditure were provided for from the produce of the copper mines which had been discovered, and where miners were always working. As in the time of Sultān Sikandar images of gold, silver, copper and other metal had been melted down, and the metal had been coined, and there was depreciation of those coins, an order was passed that coins should be struck of pure copper that was produced from the mines, and should be made current.

The Sultān was so pleasant and affable in his ways, that when he was annoyed with anyone, and exiled him from his kingdom, he did it in such a way that a man did not know, for what reason the Sultān had become annoyed with him; and it was the same in the case of anyone <sup>1</sup> who was the subject of a bad augury. People lived in his reign in anyway, and followed any religion that they wished. Most of the Brahmans, who had become Muslmāns in the reign of Sultān Sikandar apostatized again, and none of the (Musalmāns) learned men had any power or hold over them. <sup>2</sup> He brought a canal near the Mārān hill, and founded a city there, the populated portion of which extended over five *karōhs*. He also founded other cities, and settling learned and wise men and also poor men in them, was always careful to enquire about their condition. He did not try to hoard treasure, but in fact whatever came into his hand was spent on useful objects.

Couplet:

As the cash of life thou can'st not keep,  
Why over other cash should'st thou keep guard.

<sup>1</sup> The words are *و در باب هرکه تفاؤل بد برآمد همچنان میشد* the meaning of which is not at all clear. In the text-edition *راند می تفاؤل بد می* is a better reading.

<sup>2</sup> I have not been able to identify the Mārān hill. Firishtah also has *کوه ماران*; but Col. Briggs does not appear to mention it. Rodgers (*J.A.S.B.*, vol. LIV, p. 103) refers to this where he says, "The king brought a canal from the mountain; and built a city five *koss* in circumference." The Cambridge History of India, page 281, says "he founded a city, bridged rivers, restored temples and conveyed water for the irrigation of the land", but neither it nor Rodgers makes any attempt to identify the locality. Jonarāja mentions Mandaragiri (l. 858) as a locality where he made the waters, which had hitherto been useless, useful and fruitful; and Nandaśaila (l. 860) as a hill from which he brought down a canal; but I have not been able to find out anything more about these places.



And in his time, a man of the name of Sultān Muḥammad was born, who was both a poet and a wise man. He could compose extempore verses in any form and meter he wished. He also immediately and without any consideration solved any literary difficulty that was propounded to him. The Sultān showed honour to the learned men of Islām, and said, "They are my preceptors." He also showed honour to *Yogīs* on account of their poverty and austerity; and he did not look at the defects of any community. As he had great intelligence he immediately solved every difficult problem, in the solution of which other men were unsuccessful. Among such problems (there was the case of) a woman who had a grudge against one of her servants, and having killed one of her own children, threw the body into the servant's house. Early the next morning, when the accusation fell upon the latter, she went to the Sultān praying for justice. The *vazīrs*, after much enquiry, confessed their inability to find out the truth of the matter. The Sultān himself turned his attention to its decision. He first of all summoned the servant, who had been accused, to his private chamber; and there threatened her in various ways, and left no stone unturned in the matter. As the woman was innocent of the act she made no confession of any kind. At last the Sultān said, "If you become naked, and in the presence of men go to your own house, that might be a proof of your innocence." The woman cast her head down in shame, and said, "For me it is better to die than to act in this way. I consent to my punishment, but I cannot consent to behave in this way."

The Sultān then withdrew his hand from her, and sending for the other woman, who was making the accusation, said, "If you are honest in making this complaint make yourself naked in the presence of men." The woman <sup>1</sup> without any hesitation wanted to become naked. The Sultān told her not to do so, and said, "The <sup>2</sup> guilt of this act is yours, you made a false accusation against your servant;" and after they had struck her a few strokes, she confessed her guilt.

---

<sup>1</sup> The reading in one MS. and in the lith. ed. is as I have it in the text, except that the last word in the lith. ed. is شوند and not شدن.

<sup>2</sup> Both MSS. and the lith. ed. say that این کار اوست. I think the first word should be مجرم. In the text-edition جرم is retained.

The Sultān did not direct thieves and robbers to be executed, but he ordered that they should work every day with chains on their feet on public buildings, and should be supplied with their food. He also forbade all hunting, so that animals might not be killed. He did not eat any meat in the month of Ramaḍān; and, owing to his munificence, many performers of vocal and instrumental music came from various places to Kashmīr. Among these was Mullā 'Uḍī, who was one of the <sup>1</sup> poor pupils of Khwājah 'Abd-ul-qādir and came from Khurāsān. He played on the 'Uḍ (some instrument like a lute or a harp or a lyre) in such a way that it was a source of great pleasure to the Sultān; and he was exalted with various favours. Mullā Jamīl Ḥāfiẓ, who was unrivalled in versification as also in elocution, also received great favours from the Sultān. <sup>2</sup> His drawings (*naqshhāi*) are celebrated to this day in Kashmīr; and <sup>3</sup> Ḥabīb a maker of fire-works or of guns, who (first) manufactured muskets in Kashmīr, lived in his reign, and had no rival in his art. The Sultān in concert with him wrote a book containing questions and answers; this work is of very great value. There were many dancers, <sup>4</sup> rope-dancers and *natwāhs* (actors ?) in his time. There had also been men in Kashmīr who sang one tune in twelve different modes or variations.

At certain times, when the Sultān wished to be gay and cheerful, he ordered that <sup>5</sup> *Rubābs* and *Bīns* and other musical instruments

<sup>1</sup> The words in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. are *که از شاگردان بیواسطه*. One of the meanings of *بیواسطه* in the dictionary is "without means". Firishtah in the corresponding passage omits the word *بیواسطه*.

<sup>2</sup> Rodgers (p. 104) translates this sentence as "his name is a proverb in Kashmīr for excellence in poetry." The word about which I am doubtful is *naqsh*, which ordinarily means a drawing. I wonder whether it means a tune here. The word occurs again a few lines further down, where one *naqsh* is said to have been rendered in twelve modes or forms.

<sup>3</sup> The name is written as *حبیب* Ḥabīb in both MSS., and as *حلب* Ḥalb in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has *جب* Jah, and Rodgers also has Jah.

<sup>4</sup> The word is *ریسمان بازیان* in the Ṭabaqāt, and *طناب بازیان* in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. Rodgers has "acrobats". The next word is *نتروما* in one MS., and *نتروما* in the other and *نیوما* in the lith. ed. There is no corresponding word in Firishtah; and I cannot find *نتروما* or *نتر* in the dictionary. It may be that *نتروما* or *نتر* is a corruption of the Sanskrit *नट*, an actor.

<sup>5</sup> A *Rubāb* is four-stringed instrument in the form of a short-necked guitar, but having a surface of parchment instead of wood. I cannot find *بین* Bīn



acquainted with Persian, Indian, Tibetan and other languages; and many books in the Arabic and Persian languages were translated by his orders into the *Hindvī* language; and the <sup>1</sup> *Mahābhārat* which is a most famous book, and the book called *Rājatarāṅgiṇī*, which is the name of a history of the *Bādshāhs* of Kashmir, were translated into Persian by his order.

The pardoned (late) Sultān Abū Sa'id sent 'Arab horses and Bactrian camels from *Khurāsān* as presents to the Sultān. The latter was highly pleased at this, and in reply sent donkeyloads of saffron, <sup>2</sup> paper, musk, shawls and cups of glass or crystal and other wonderful products of Kashmir for the acceptance of the *Khāqān* (sovereign) who has since attained to Divine mercy. Sultān Bahlūl Lūdī and Sultān Maḥmūd Gujrātī sent the finest things of their respective kingdoms, and strengthened the relations of affection. The rulers of Mecca, the revered, and of Egypt and Gilān and other countries also sent fine and beautiful presents, and maintained similar relations. The *Bādshāh* of Sind sent many equipages and other <sup>3</sup>things <sup>4</sup>with one of his servants, with an ode in praise of the Sultān. The latter was highly pleased on reading the ode. When Dūngar Sēn, the Rāja of Gwāliar, came to know the Sultān's great love for the science of music and singing, he sent two or three valuable treatises

<sup>1</sup> The MSS. are very imperfect here. One of them leaves out the entire passage from کتاب مہابارت ترجمہ کردند to مشہور. The other omits the words مشہور است و کتاب. The lith. ed. is more correct, but it and the second MS. both call the *Rājatarāṅgiṇī* the *Rājatarāṅgi* and describe it as a history of the *Bādshāhs* of Hind or India. Firishtah has *Rājatarāṅgiṇī* and calls it the history of the *Bādshāhs* of Kashmir.

<sup>2</sup> The word is variously written. In the MSS. it is قناس, and قطاس. In the lith. ed. it looks like قطاس. I cannot find any meaning of any of these words except "paper", which might be sent as a present. Rodgers (p. 105) translates the word as "pepper".

<sup>3</sup> The lith. ed. has اسپان horses after اشیای; but as neither MS. has the word I have omitted it.

<sup>4</sup> The MSS. and the lith. ed. appear to be imperfect here. The MSS. have بمصعرب یکی, and the lith. ed. has باو قصیده; neither of which makes sense. I think the correct reading should be از بمصعرب یکی; and I have interpolated the necessary words, which have been adopted in the text-edition.

on these sciences; and his son Rāja <sup>1</sup> Gōp Singh also after him kept the relations of sincerity and attachment intact. The Rāja of Tibet got hold of <sup>2</sup> two wonderful animals of an elegant shape, which are called *Hans* in the language of the people of India, from the place called Mānsarwar, the water of which is subject to no change, and sent them to the Sultān. The latter was exceedingly pleased on seeing them. Among their other characteristics one was, that when milk mixed with water was placed before them, they separated the milk from water with their beaks and drank it and pure water was left behind.

The Sultān, in the beginning of his reign, made Muḥammad, his brother, his successor, and left all affairs in his charge. After his death he confided in his son Haider in his place, and left all affairs in his charge. He also distinguished his two foster brothers, named Mas'ūd and <sup>3</sup> Shēr, by great proximity to his person; but in the end they fell out, and Shēr killed Mas'ūd, who was his younger brother, and in retaliation the Sultān had him executed.

The Sultān had <sup>4</sup> three sons, one, Ādam Khān, who was the eldest, but who always appeared wretched in the eyes of the Sultān, and Hājī Khān, and Bahrām Khān; he was the youngest of all, but had an extensive *jūgīr*. And he conferred the title of <sup>5</sup> Daryū Khān on a

<sup>1</sup> The name is differently written. One MS. has کوب نند while the other has کوب سیدہ, and the lith. ed. has کوب سیدہ. The name can, I think, be only Gōp Singh or Kōb Sing. In the text-edition M. Hidayat Ḥosain has adopted کوب سن.

<sup>2</sup> Firishtah says the animals were called *rājahans* by the people of India, and the place, where they were obtained, was the *haud* called *Sarwar* and not *mauḍa* called Mānsarwar.

<sup>3</sup> One MS. calls the elder foster brother ما سیر Masūr by mistake, while further down it calls him شیر Shēr.

<sup>4</sup> According to Jonarāja he had four sons by the daughter of the king of Madra, named respectively आदाम खान, देव्या खान, जम्सरय खान and बहेराम खान (lines 855 and 856), of whom only the 1st, 2nd and 4th are named in the Persian histories. In the *Rājatarāṅgiṇī* of Śrīvara (1st tarāṅga, line 56) he is said, however, to have had only three sons, whose names are somewhat differently written, viz., आदम खान, राज्य खान and बह्राम खान ।

<sup>5</sup> The MSS. have اوريا, and دريا instead of قادريا. The lith. ed. and the lith. ed. of Firishtah have ملا دريا Mullā Daryā.

man of unknown descent called Mullā Daryā, and placed him in charge of all affairs, and occupied himself with pleasure and enjoyment.

<sup>1</sup> When Śrī Bhat, who was the *razār*, departed from the world, the Sultān dedicated, in memory of him, one *krōr* of the gold of Kashmir, which is equivalent to four hundred *ashrafīs* or gold mohurs, to his sons.

The Sultān was an adept in the (occult) sciences of the *Yogīs*; and men had seen <sup>2</sup> his spirit leaving his body which is called <sup>3</sup> *Śimiyā*.



eldest, left Kashmir; and with a great army invaded the country of (little) Tibet. He conquered the whole of that country; and brought an immense quantity of booty to the Sultān; and became the recipient of favours. <sup>1</sup> Hāji Khān, under the Sultān's orders, marched to attack Lōharkōt. Owing to the intemperate behaviour of Hāji Khān, the Sultān always kept Ādam Khān near him. At last, at the instigation of some of the people of Lōharkōt, Hāji Khān advanced towards Kashmir (*i.e.*, the capital). Although the Sultān sent written and verbal messages to him that he should not come, they had no effect. Having no other alternative the Sultān left the city with the intention of engaging him in battle and encamped in the plain of <sup>2</sup> Pallasilā. Although Hāji Khān repented of his conduct, yet

<sup>1</sup> Lines 82, 83 say that when Ādam Khān returned after conquering the Bhuttas, Hāji Khān marched to the Lōhāra mountain (Lohkote according to Col. Briggs, vol. IV, p. 471), by the Sultān's order, and as the latter knew that two knives could not be placed in one sheath, he ordered their coming and going. Śrīvara then describes the way in which Hāji Khān's adherents incited him to return to Kashmir (lines 85-108); and in line 110 he says that the king quickly left the city with his army on hearing of his son's approach.

<sup>2</sup> The name of the place is written in the MS. as يلهل Yelhal, and سهل which may be anything; and تليل Tillil in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has بليل Balil. In the text-edition it is بلسل. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 471) has Bulesl and Rodgers has Pulpul. Śrīvara Paṇḍit calls the place where the two armies met and whence the Sultān sent a Brahmin as ambassador to Hāji Khān, पद्मशिलाग्रान् (l. 117), but where that was I cannot find out, except that if it was on the route between Śrinagar and Lōharkōt, it was somewhere to the east of the former place, and probably near the Pir Panjāl range. The ambassador's message and speech are also given at some length (lines 119-128) and ending with the threat, "Your commanders would be slain like sparrows!" Hāji Khān's adherents were of course angry but he said that he would go and fall at his father's feet, and whether he was pleased or angry he could do to him whatever he liked (line 132 *et seq.*). His adherents, however, adjured him to go on with what he had begun. They said, "Let us fight, if we are victorious, you get the kingdom. If we die, you die; wait only till we fight; if we are slain, do as you think proper." Hearing these words Hāji Khān was sunk in a sea of thought (l. 142). The Sultān on hearing what the ambassador had to say, ordered his army to begin the battle. After the battle had gone on for the whole day, Hāji Khān turned back (l. 164).

It appears, however, from the end of the first *taraṅga* of Śrīvara's poem, that he calls it the मणशिलायुद्धवर्णनम् । So the name of the battle-field was



at the instigation of adventure-seeking men, he arrayed his army and marched to the field; and the battle went on from morning till evening. In the end, the army of Hājī Khān was defeated. Many deeds of bravery were performed by Ādam Khān in the battle. Hājī Khān fled towards <sup>1</sup>Hirpūr and Ādam Khān hastened in pursuit and tried to seize him; but the Sultān did not allow him to do so. Hājī Khān came from Hirpūr to <sup>2</sup>Bhimbar; and occupied himself with the treatment of the wounded. After the victory, the Sultān returned to Kashmir and ordered <sup>3</sup>the erection of a high minaret of the heads of his enemies and had the men belonging to Hājī Khān's army, who had been taken prisoners, put to death. He also inflicted great tortures on their families and descendants. On account of this most people separated from Hājī Khān, and came to Ādam Khān.

Mallaṣilā, but whether Pallaṣilā and Mallaṣilā are two places or whether Pallaṣilā is a mistake for Mallaṣilā or *vice versa*, I cannot make out.

<sup>1</sup> The name is written as **نیشر پور** and **بیرہ جود** in the MSS. and **نیشر پور** in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has **ہیرہ پور** and this has been adopted in the text-edition, and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 472) has Heerpoor. Both Rodgers and the Cambridge History of India say Hājī Khān fled to Bhimbar, but according to the *Ṭabaqāt* and Firishtah, he came to Bhimbar from the place mentioned in this passage. In Śrīvara, I, line 166, mention is made (apparently) of Ādam Khān's ferocity in the neighbourhood of Śūrapura. It appears that Hirpūr (Hirpūr) or Hurapor is the modern name of Śūrapura which is often described as the entrance station to Kashmir. I think, therefore, I will not be far wrong in calling the place Hirpūr.

<sup>2</sup> The name is **ببر** in one MS. and **بنیر** in the other and **نیر** in the lith. ed. of the *Ṭabaqāt*. **نبر** is adopted by M. Hidayat Ḥosain in the text-edition. It looks like **بنیر** Banīr or Nābīr in the lith. ed. of Firishtah, and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 472) has Nero. Rodgers has Bhimbar and so has the Cambridge History of India. Śrīvara in his *Rājataranṅinī* (1st *taranṅa*, l. 169) says **वायव्यानः सानुतापश्चिददेशे स्थितिं यथात् ।** I cannot find out where Citradēśa was.

<sup>3</sup> As regards this, see Śrīvara's *Rājataranṅinī*, 1st *taranṅa*, lines 171-174. It appears that **कारणिक** or merciful Sultān was **दुःखित**, and he was thoroughly dissatisfied with himself and his servants; it is not therefore likely that he should make a minaret of the heads of the slain, who are described as the **सङ्क्रामयन्तीरेन्द्र**; though I cannot make out what the **सुखागार** was, that he made of the rows of the heads of the warriors who were killed in the battle. Was it a rest chamber, a sort of Valhalla? But even in that case the rows of heads would be a grisly decoration.

<sup>1</sup> After that Ādam Khān ruled (the country) with full authority for six years. Later on there was a <sup>2</sup> terrible famine in the country of Kashmir, so that a large number of men died of hunger. Owing to this the Sultān became very sorrowful, and distributed most of the grain in the royal treasuries (granaries) among the people; and reduced the land revenue in some places to one quarter, and in others to one-seventh (of the fixed amount). And <sup>3</sup> Ādam Khān having acquired

<sup>1</sup> Firishtah says Ādam Khān was at this time declared to be the Sultān's successor, and he ruled for six years. Col. Briggs and Rodgers also say that he was made the heir to the throne. The Cambridge History of India does not say distinctly that he was declared to be the heir to the throne, but it says that he participated for six years largely in the administration of the kingdom. Śrīvara (I, l. 182) says यीवराज्ये सुखं तद्दुर्मुने पञ्चशः समाः.

<sup>2</sup> The famine is described at some length by Śrīvara, I, lines 184-213; in fact the whole of the 2nd canto of the 1st *tarāṅga* which is called पङ्क्तिशवर्षे दुर्भिक्षवर्णनम् is a description of the famine which occurred in the 26th year of the reign. He mentions the fact that the Sultān fed the people with his own paddy, i.e., with the paddy in the royal granaries, but he does not appear to mention the reduction of the various demands.

There were, according to Śrīvara, heavy rains and great floods after the famine, though this is not mentioned by the Musalmān historians. The heavy clouds frightened the people as enemies are frightened by showers of arrow (I, l. 217), and the *Ītastā* (the Jhelum), the *Ledarī* (the Lidar river), the *Sindhu* a tributary of the *Ītastā*, which flows into the latter at Prayāg or the *Ītastā-Sindhu-Saṅgama*, a place of considerable sanctity and the *Kṣiptikā* (the canal in Srinagar, now the Kutakul) and other rivers submerged the villages on their banks as if in a terrible rivalry of one another (I, l. 221). According to the *Tarikh-i-Rashīdī* (Elias and Dennison Ross, p. 223) flows from the Zoji pass down towards the Jhelum and was called the Lar. Stein does not give any modern name for it, but says the two Sinds are distinguished by the Indus being called the Buḍ Sind. He also says that the valley of the other Sind forms the district of Lar. The merciful Sultān went round in a boat inspecting the damage caused by the rains and he greatly sympathised with the people in their privations (I, lines 239, 240). After that everyone was happy with a full harvest (I, l. 243).

<sup>3</sup> How he acquired the power is not quite clear. Firishtah does not give any information, but he only says he acquired the power to plunder and ravage دمت بتاراج يافته. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 472) says "At this time he deputed Adhum Khan with a force to march and attack the fort of Gujraj", which is not at all correct. Rodgers (*J.A.S.B.*, vol. LIV, p. 106) begins with "In his government of Kamraj" Ādam Khān was very oppressive, but he does not say

power in the country of Kamrāj, committed <sup>1</sup> various acts of oppression. And <sup>2</sup> many people came to the Sultān, and complained against him. He refused to receive all *farmāns* which were sent by the Sultān; and finally collecting a large army marched to attack the Sultān; and <sup>3</sup> halted at Quṭb-ud-dīnpūr. The Sultān acting on the purport of the couplet;

Couplet:

Attack not an army, larger than on your own,  
For <sup>4</sup> on a lancet thou canst not strike thy fist.

satisfied him by <sup>5</sup> various devices and sent him back to the country of Kamrāj; and <sup>6</sup> sent for Hājī Khān with great quickness.

that the Sultān appointed Ādam Khān to that government. The Cambridge History of India, page 283, says "After the famine Ādam Khān was entrusted with the government of the Kamrāj district". But it appears from I, line 273 of Śrīvara's *Rājatarāṅgiṇī*, that his mind having become vitiated on account of his jealousy of his younger brother, he suddenly attacked the country; and from I, line 278, that one day being excited by the intoxication of being the Yuvarāja (heir to the kingdom) he went to the Kramarājya.

<sup>1</sup> One MS. omits by mistake the words from *و بسیار مردم نمودند*.

<sup>2</sup> His and his followers' atrocious acts are described by Śrīvara in I, lines 280-290; and it is said in line 291 that when the king's messenger told his followers not to commit such oppression, they replied, "Let the king, if he is vexed, go on crying."

<sup>3</sup> Śrīvara says in I, line 293, that having collected and equipped his forces at Kuddadenapura (Quṭb-ud-dīnpūr) he came to attack the Sultān's forces at Jainanagara. Firishtah also mentions Quṭb-ud-dīnpūr. I cannot however find anything about its situation. About Jainanagara or rather *J(Z)ainanagarī*, it appears from Jonarāja, line 871, that Zain-ul-'ābidin carried the canal called Jainagaṅgā on which his new town Jainanagarī was built (see the notes on pp. 111 and 112 of Stein's *Rājatarāṅgiṇī*, vol. I) as far as Raṇasvāmin. This *J(Z)ainanagarī* was not far from the capital.

<sup>4</sup> The reading in the MSS. which I have accepted is *زدن مشت بر نیشتر*. The lith. ed. has *زد انگشت بر نیشتر*.

<sup>5</sup> I cannot find out what these devices were. Śrīvara (I, l. 297) also has *मन्त्रयुक्तिभिः*, i.e., by politic measures.

<sup>6</sup> Śrīvara mentions the sending of the letter to Hājī Khān in I, lines 299-300. The letter contained a rather piteous appeal. *यत्र सत्प्राणसन्देशे गतिर्नान्या त्वया विना ।*

Ādam Khān on arriving in Kamrāj advanced from there without any delay, and attacked <sup>1</sup>Suyyapūr. The governor of the place, who had held that position from before the time of the Sultān, came out and engaged him, and was slain; and the whole of <sup>2</sup>the city was destroyed. The Sultān hearing this news, sent a great army to attack Ādam Khān; and there was <sup>3</sup>a great battle. Many were killed in both the armies, and Ādam Khān was defeated. When the bridge which had been erected at Suyyapūr across the river Bihat (Vīṭastā or Jhelum) broke down, <sup>4</sup>about three hundred of the chief men on Ādam Khān's side were drowned, as they were crossing the river in their flight.

Ādam Khān crossed the river and saw a place (for resting) on that bank. The Sultān came out of the capital, and coming towards Suyyapūr, comforted the *ra'iyats*. At this time Hājī Khān, in compliance with the *farmān* which had been sent to him, arrived by way of <sup>5</sup>Punch to the vicinity of <sup>6</sup>Bāramūlā. The Sultān sent his

<sup>1</sup> Suyyapura, the modern Sōpur, the chief place in *pargana* Zainagīr, which lies at a short distance from the point where the Vīṭastā leaves the Wular Lake. *شهر سوپہ* is adopted by M. Hidayat Hosain in the text.

<sup>2</sup> Both MSS. have *تمام شہر بغادت رفت* but the lith. ed. has *تمام شہر و ولایت بغادت رفت*. I have omitted the words *ولایت*.

<sup>3</sup> Śrīvara does not, as far as I can make out, mention the attack of Suyyapura by Ādam Khān, and the latter's battle with the governor of the place; but he mentions the battle between the Sultān's and Ādam Khān's armies (I, lines 304-306).

<sup>4</sup> This is also mentioned by Śrīvara (I, l. 308).

<sup>5</sup> The name of the place is *پنچہ* and *پنچہ* without any dots in the MSS. They cannot, therefore, be pronounced or translated with any certainty. In the lith. ed. it is *بنجہ* Banjah and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah it is *پنچہ* Panjah or Punjah, and this has been followed in the text-edition. Neither Col. Briggs nor Rodger nor the Cambridge History of India mentions the place, and I cannot find any place like Banja or Punja near Bāramūlā. In I, line 322, Śrīvara says that Hājī Khān arrived at this time at Parṇotsa, which (corresponding to the modern Punch, or Prunṭs, the Kashmiri form) seems to have been included in Lohara and have been situated in the lower valley of the Tēhī (Tauṣī, *vide* Stein's *Rājatarangīnī*, vol. II, p. 433). Punch is sufficiently like Panjah which is the name of the place in Firishtah. I have accepted Punch.

<sup>6</sup> This agrees exactly with Śrīvara (I, l. 323), Bāramūlā being called Varāhamūlā. The name is derived from the ancient Tīrtha of Viṣṇu Ādi Varāha

youngest son Bahrām to welcome him. <sup>1</sup> A great affection grew up between the two brothers. Ādam Khān fled from the place where he was, and went to the Nilāb (the Indus) by way of <sup>2</sup> Shāhbang. The Sultān taking Hājī Khān with him returned to the capital, and made the latter his heir and successor. The latter girded up his loins in devotion to his father, and left no *minutiae* in his service unobserved. He recommended his own servants, who had been his companions and friends <sup>3</sup> during his travels in India, for all the high appointments in the government; and obtained these for them from the Sultān; and allotted to them fine *jāgīrs*. The Sultān gave him a jewelled gold belt from the Sultān; and was <sup>4</sup> always pleased with him.

(the bear incarnation of Viṣṇu) who was worshipped there evidently since early times (see Stein's *Rājatarāṅgīnī*, vol. II, p. 482).

<sup>1</sup> Compare Śrīvara's *Rājatarāṅgīnī*, I, line 324.

<sup>2</sup> The name looks like شَاه منگ Shāh Mank and شَاه بیک Shāh Bik in the MSS. and شَاه نیک Shāh Nik in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has شَاه شَاهزاه Shāhshāh and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 473) has Shahabad. In the text-edition it is شَاه منگ. Rodgers says the Sultān with the aid of Hājī Khān drove Ādam Khān out of the valley, without mentioning the name of any place and the Cambridge History of India, page 283, says Ādam Khān "fled to the Indus". It appears from Śrīvara's *Rājatarāṅgīnī*, I, line 326, that he महाहिमवत्या सिन्धुं दनुतीर्य दलान्वितः । प्राप सिन्धुपतेर्देशम्, i.e., crossing the Sindhu by way of Śāhibhāṅga arrived with his army in the country of the Lord of the Sindhu. It should be noted that the first Sindhu is not the Indus, but a tributary of the *Īṭasā* and the second Sindhu is the Indus or the *Nīla*. The Śāhibhāṅga of Śrīvara appears to be identical with the large village of Shādīpūr which is opposite to the junction of the *Īṭasā* and the *Sindhu*. Shādīpūr appears to be an abbreviation of Shihāb-ud-dīnpūr, but when and why it got the name of Shāhband or Śāhibhāṅga is not clear.

<sup>3</sup> There is some difference in the readings. One MS. has که از سفر خند, که از سفر خند باد رفاقت کرده بودند, while the other has که از سفر خند باد رفاقت کرده بودند, while the lith. ed. has که در سفر و حضر باو رفاقت کرده بودند. The readings in the MS. are manifestly incorrect, but if the mistakes are corrected, they would mean, who were his companions and friends in his travels in India. The reading in the lith. ed. is more correct, but I cannot find any meaning of حضر.

<sup>4</sup> Śrīvara describes at some length (I, lines 336-387) the various pleasant journeys of the Sultān and his son through the flower-adorned country, with musical and other entertainments and calls the canto, which is the fourth in his first *tarāṅga*, the पुष्पलीलावर्णन, i.e., the description of the flower

<sup>1</sup> At last Hājī Khān contracted dysentery owing to constant drinking, and there was great confusion in the government. The

carnival. Then he adds another (the fifth) canto (I, lines 387–494), which he calls the *क्रमसरयोचावर्णन*, in the course of which he describes the Sultān's visit to the Kramasaras, now called the Kaonsar Nag a mountain lake two miles long situated at the foot of the highest of the three snowy peaks (15523 feet) and which is connected with the Indian deluge story, and the peak to which *Viṣṇu* in his fish *avatāra* had bound the ship (*nau*) into which *Durgā* had converted herself to save the seeds of the beans from destruction (see Stein's *Rājatarāṅgiṇī*, vol. II, p. 393). Then he has another canto (the sixth), which he calls the *चित्रोपचयशिल्पवर्णन*, which runs from line 495 to line 527. In this he first describes the excavation of the new lake called the Jainasaras near Padmapura, now called Pāmpūr, the chief place of the *Vīhi pargana*, and the erection of a palace on its bank; and then describes the different presents sent to the Sultān by various princes; and finally the advent of artists and artisans who introduced various beautiful kinds of silk weaving. He next mentions the arrival of a *रञ्जुधनशिल्पज्ञ यवन*, a Yavana rope-dancer (l. 528). After all this prosperity and advance came a period of adversity, line 534 *et seq.* There was hail, a comet made its appearance and continued to shine for two months, then the dogs were always whining, and there were eclipses of the sun and the moon both in the course of a fortnight. Then came the news (l. 576) of the death of his nephew, Śrī Kyāmdena, lord of Sindhu, who was like a son to him, and who was killed in battle by Ebbarāhima. Śrī Kyāmdena may be Ekrām-ud-dīn and Ebbarāhima was certainly Ibrāhīm; but I have not been able to find out who they were. According to Śrīvara (I, l. 581) Zain-ul-'ābidīn was at this time remembering his departed friends, servants, and companions whom he loved like his own life, he knew himself like an elephant who had gone astray from the herd (*अतीतान् बान्धवान् शून्यान् सखीन् प्राणसमान् स्मरन् । स्वात्मानमविद्वद्वाजा यूयधृष्टमिव द्विपम्*).

<sup>1</sup> Firishtah's account is somewhat different. He says the Sultān was displeased with Hājī Khān on account of the latter's excessive drinking, and his not listening to the Sultān's admonitions; and the Sultān himself began to suffer from dysentery; and as the Sultān was displeased with Hājī Khān, the work of government remained unattended to. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 43), however, agrees with the *Ṭabaqāt*, and says that Hājī Khān and not the Sultān "was seized with a bloody flux" *i.e.*, had an attack of dysentery. Rodgers and the Cambridge History of India, however, follow Firishtah. The former says, "The king was seized with dysentery, and the latter more vaguely, "the king fell sick". A reference to Śrīvara (I, l. 582) shows distinctly that the *Ṭabaqāt* and not Firishtah is correct. It is said there that *हाज्यखानस्य रक्तज्ञ । अस्वास्थ्यमुदभूतत्रित्यं मद्यपानातिषेवनान्*. The Sultān's admonitions are given in lines 585–599. In line 600 it is said that Hājī Khān promised not to drink again

<sup>1</sup> *amīrs* secretly sent for Ādam Khān. He came according to their suggestion; and saw the Sultān. The latter was <sup>2</sup> displeased at his coming, and was annoyed with the *amīrs*. In the end the brothers mutually agreed, and Ādam Khān was honoured. After some time, the weakness of old age overwhelmed the Sultān, and <sup>3</sup> besides that he became ill. The <sup>4</sup> *amīrs* and the *vazīrs* all in concert submitted to him that if the duties of the government be entrusted to one of the Sultānzādas, this would be the cause of peace and good government in the country. The <sup>5</sup> Sultān did not show any favour to this suggestion, and did not select any of his sons for the duties of the *salṭanat*. Mischief-makers then intervened, and held various meetings. Bahrām Khān acting treacherously and speaking in a <sup>6</sup> mischief-making way made the two grown-up brothers hostile to each other. <sup>7</sup> Ādam Khān, becoming suspicious, went and took up his residence in Qutb-ud-dīnpūr. When the Sultān became extremely feeble, the *amīrs* <sup>8</sup> taking precautions against all disturbances did not allow his sons to come and enquire about his health; and sometimes they seated the Sultān with some trouble at an elevated spot; and had drums

---

except by his father's orders; but going back to his own house he continued to drink (see l. 603).

<sup>1</sup> See Śrīvara's *Rājataranṅinī*, I, line 604 सन्निधः । आदमखानमानिन्गुर्दखिन्ने-दिग्गन्तरात् ।

<sup>2</sup> There is a slight difference in the readings. One MS. and the lith. ed. have از آمدن او بد برد ; while the other MS. has از آمدن او بد آمد Firishtah in the corresponding passage says سلطان املا التفات باو نمی کرد. Śrīvara in I, line 606, says प्रवेशस्य कृतोपेक्षी दृपोऽभवत् ।

<sup>3</sup> The MSS. as well as the lith. ed. have و بیماری علاوه ان گردید. This appears to me somewhat imperfect.

<sup>4</sup> This is somewhat differently stated by Śrīvara in I, lines 626-27 : तत्समचं वध्ना येऽपि तत्समद्वाद्भाषिरे । राजन्मुत्साद्यते देशो राज्यलुब्धैः सुतेस्त्व । एकस्यैव निजं राज्यं किं नार्पयसि यो दितः ।

<sup>5</sup> Śrīvara in I, lines 630-33, says that the Sultān pointed out the bad qualities of his sons, and declared that he would not bestow the kingdom on any of them; but गते मयि बलं यस्य स प्राप्नोत्विति मे मतम्, i.e., after my death let him who has the strength get it.

<sup>6</sup> One MS. has نفاق امیر but the other and the lith. ed. have نفاق.

<sup>7</sup> This is mentioned by Śrīvara in I, lines 685-689.

<sup>8</sup> One MS. omits فتنه by mistake.

beaten to inform the people that the Sultān had recovered. By this plan they managed to keep the country on its feet (*i.e.*, safe from disturbances). At last when the Sultān's illness became very serious, and he remained unconscious for a whole day and night, one night <sup>1</sup> Adam Khān came alone from Quṭb-ud-dīnpūr to see him, and left his army outside the city, so that it may keep watch on Hājī Khān and other enemies. On that night Hasan Kachhī, who was one of the great *amīrs*, had taken the promise of allegiance to Hājī Khān from the *amīrs* in the audience hall of the Sultān. On the following day the *amīrs* got Adam Khān out of Kashmīr by some plan; and summoned Hājī Khān with great promptitude. <sup>2</sup> Hājī Khān came in compliance of the summons of the *amīrs*, and took possession of all the horses in the Sultān's stables, and a large army collected round him; but on account of apprehensions of disturbances and the treachery of his enemy, <sup>3</sup> he did not go inside the palace.

When Ādam Khān heard this news he became frightened; and retired to Hindūstān by way of <sup>4</sup> Nāwil. Many of his retainers

<sup>1</sup> Firishtah's account is slightly different. According to him Ādam Khān left his soldiers in the environs of the city and he himself passed the night in the audience chamber of the Sultān. Hasan Khān Kachhī also took the promise of allegiance to Hājī Khān from the *amīrs* that same night in the audience chamber. The account of the behaviour of the three princes and of their movements, which agrees generally with that in the text, is given by Śrīvara, I, line 717 *et seq.* Hasan Kachhī is described in line 724 as वसुनकोपेशः or Hasan, the treasurer. He is also described as स्वार्थी मोहयन् परान्, *i.e.*, deceiving others blinded by his selfishness. Ādam Khān is said to have gone to Quṭb-ud-dīnpūr (I, l. 725).

<sup>2</sup> This is also mentioned by Śrīvara, I, line 728. I do not understand why so much importance was attached to the possession of the horses.

<sup>3</sup> Śrīvara, I, line 731, says he was unable to go to see his father for fear of treachery although he was anxious to do so (भोक्तोऽपि द्रोहशङ्कया). Zain-ul-ʿābidīn died later दादग्याँ अष्टमासस्य मध्याह्ने, *i.e.*, at midday on the 12th lunar day in the month of *Jyaiṣṭha* (I, l. 744).

<sup>4</sup> I cannot find anything about this place. It is written like ناول in one MS. and مارول in the other and ناول in the lith. ed. Firishtah has Bārāmūlā the well-known pass. M. Hidayat Hosain has adopted مارول in the text-edition.



separated from him. - Zain Badr, who was one of the trusted chiefs of Hājī Khān, hastened in pursuit of him. Ādam Khān fought bravely, and having slain many of his near relations escaped. Hasan Khān, son of Hājī Khān, who was at <sup>2</sup> Pūnch, came to his father; and the affairs of Hājī Khān were splendidly arranged.

The Sultān (i.e., Zain-ul-'ābidīn) passed away from the world.  
<sup>3</sup> The period of his rule was 52 years.

AN ACCOUNT OF <sup>4</sup> SULTĀN HAIDAR SHĀH, SON OF SULTĀN  
 ZAIN-UL-'ABIDĪN, WHO HAD THE NAME OF HĀJĪ KHĀN.

Three days after his father's (death) Hājī Khān took the latter's place and assumed the title of Sultān Haidar; and having ascended the throne in the manner of his father at <sup>5</sup> Sikandarpūr, which is

---

famous as <sup>1</sup>Naushahr he gave away to deserving men the gold which was scattered over him. His brother <sup>2</sup>Bahrām K̤hān and his son Ḥasan K̤hān placed the crown of the empire on his head; and continued to serve him.

Couplet:

When death casts away the crown from one head,  
The sky (providence) places it on another's head.

He allotted the country of <sup>3</sup>Kamrāj as the *jāgīr* of Ḥasan K̤hān; and made him the *Amīr-ul-umarā* and his heir and successor. He allotted <sup>4</sup>Nagam as the *jāgīr* of Bahram K̤hān. He permitted the Rājās of the different districts, who had come to offer condolence on the death of the late Sultān, and congratulations to the new Sultān on his accession, to return to their territories after bestowing on them horses and robes of honour. He also bestowed on most of the *amīrs* jewelled swords and robes.

He had innate generosity, but was always drunk, and as he had a vindictive temperament, most of the *amīrs*, being aggrieved with him, went away to their *jāgīrs*. As he was careless about the state of the kingdom, the *vazīrs* perpetrated various acts of oppression on the *ra'iyats*. He distinguished a barber of the name of <sup>5</sup>Bōli by proximating him to his person; and acted according to what he said to him. The barber took bribes from men, and turned the Sultān's disposition

<sup>1</sup> نوشهر in the text-edition.

<sup>2</sup> See line 7 of the 2nd *tarāṅga* of the *Rājatarāṅgiṇī* of Śrīvara where it is said that his younger brother and his son standing before the Sultān were like *Sukra* and *Brhaspati* shining in front of the moon.

<sup>3</sup> The allotment of Kamrāj as the *jāgīr* of Ḥasan K̤hān does not appear to be mentioned by Śrīvara; but he says (l. 10 of the 2nd *tarāṅga*) बह्राम-खानं नाग्रामदेये त स्वामिनं यधात् ।

<sup>4</sup> Nāgām or Nāgrāma was a district of considerable extent in southern part of *Maḍararājya*.

<sup>5</sup> The name is بولی in one MS. and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. It is rather difficult to decipher it in the other MS.; and it is تولی in the lith. ed. of the *Tabaqāt*. He is mentioned repeatedly by Śrīvara in the 2nd *tarāṅga*, see lines 35, 47, etc.), but I cannot find his name. He is called Lūlū by Rodgers (*J.A.S.B.*, vol. LIV, p. 107) and Lūli in the *Cambridge History of India*, p. 284. لولی in the text-edition.

against anyone with whom he happened to be on bad terms. <sup>1</sup> Ḥasan Kachhī, who before all others had endeavoured to secure the allegiance of the *amīrs* to the Sultān, was put to death on the accusation of the barber Bōlī.

Before this <sup>2</sup> Ādam Khān had collected a large army, and had arrived in the country of Jammū in order to fight the Sultān. When the news of the murder of the *amīrs* reached him, he turned back and went to Jammū. He then went to fight some Mughals, who had come to that neighbourhood to aid and reinforce the troops of Mānik Dēv Rāja of Jammū, was struck by an arrow in the mouth and died of that wound. <sup>3</sup> The Sultān was sorrowful on hearing of his death, and ordered that his dead body might be brought from the battlefield, and buried near that of his father.

At that time owing to his (excessive and) continual drinking several serious diseases attacked the Sultān. <sup>4</sup> The *amīrs* conspired secretly with Bahrām Khān, and wanted to place him on the throne. When this news reached <sup>5</sup> Ḥasan Khān, who had conquered many

<sup>1</sup> The name is برکچی Bar Kachī in one MS. and in the lith. ed., and is rather indistinct in the other MS. Firishtah lith. ed. has Ḥasan Khān Kachhī. He was called Ḥasan Kachhī before this in the Ṭabaqāt. And Ḥasan Koṣeṭa or Ḥasan the treasurer by Śrīvara. As to his murder see line 79 of the 2nd *taraṅga* of Śrīvara's *Rājatarāṅgiṇī*.

<sup>2</sup> See line 107 of the 2nd *taraṅga* of the *Rājatarāṅgiṇī* of Śrīvara where the Rājā of Jammu or *Madramanḍala* is called Māṇikya Deva and the Mughals are called the *Turuṣkas*. Firishtah agrees, but he calls the Rājā ملک دیو Rājā Mulk or Malik Dēv. Neither Col. Briggs nor Rodgers nor the Cambridge History of India gives his name.

<sup>3</sup> See line 110 of the 2nd *taraṅga* of Śrīvara's *Rājatarāṅgiṇī*, where however the dead body is said to have been buried near that of his mother (तद्देशाच्चव-मान्तीय जननीसन्निधौ न्यधात्) ।

<sup>4</sup> I cannot find the mention of any actual conspiracy of the *amīrs* or ministers to place Bahrām Khān on the throne in Śrīvara's *Rājatarāṅgiṇī*. It is only said in line 160 of the 2nd *taraṅga* तावद्धाम बहाम-खानो दामनिरंगलः । आक्रान्तमन्त्रिसामन्तो ज्ञात्वा यमनिर्ग नृपं ॥

<sup>5</sup> Firishtah, who is followed by Col. Briggs and Rodgers, says that it was Faṭh Khān, son of Ādam Khān who was making these conquests, but the Cambridge History of India, page 284, agrees with the Ṭabaqāt in saying that it was Ḥasan Khān the Sultān's son who was raiding the Punjab. According to Śrīvara, line 144 of the 2nd *taraṅga*, he (*i.e.*, Ḥaidar Shāh) sent his son

fortresses in India, and had acquired much booty : he with his victorious army returned to Kashmīr by forced marches. As his return was without (the Sultān's) permission, interested and malicious persons having said words, (as if) from his side, turned the disposition of Sultān Ḥaidar (from him). <sup>1</sup> The latter being annoyed with him did not allow him to make his *gūrnish*; and none of his services was accepted.

<sup>2</sup> One day the Sultān climbed to the polished terrace roof of a palace and occupied himself in drinking. In his drunken condition his foot slipped, and he fell down and died.

<sup>3</sup> The period of his sovereignty was one year and two months.

<sup>4</sup> AN ACCOUNT OF SULTĀN ḤASAN, SON OF ḤAJI KHĀN ḤAIDAR SHĀH.

He ascended the throne sixteen days after the death of his father,

---

with an army outside the kingdom for a (conquering expedition). Then in line 159 it is said करदौक्षतभूपालः स षण्मासकृतस्त्रितिः। अथवच्चैत्रमासान्ते कश्मीरागमनोत्सुकः ॥ i.e., having made many kings his tributaries, and having stayed for six months, he became anxious to return to Kashmīr at the end of the month of *Caitra*, and then in line 162 he goes on to say that the wicked ministers shrivelled up on Ḥasan Khān's arrival, as lotuses are shrivelled up on the rising of the full-moon.

<sup>1</sup> The Sultān's behaviour towards his son as described by Śrīvara Paṇḍit cannot be clearly understood. He was apparently afraid of Bahrām Khān, and so, as is said in line 166, he gave his son, who had returned from his conquering expedition merely a sight of himself यात्रागताय पुत्राय ददौ दर्शनमात्रकं and in the next line it is said that he was certainly afraid of Bahrām Khān, otherwise how was it that he did not honour his son with giving him robes of honour नूनं खानुजभौनोभूतत्कालं सोऽन्यथा कथं। परिधानादिसत्कारं नूनमेवाकरोत्युते ॥ At the same time he was secretly very angry with Bahrām Khān like the *Samī* tree with the fire concealed in it, fearing that the latter might injure the son. (बह्मामो बाधते नूनं सत्युचमिति शङ्कितः। स तस्मिंश्चन्द्रकोपाग्निः शमीतस्वरिवाभवत् ॥)

<sup>2</sup> The scene and the nature of the accident and subsequent treatment are described by Śrīvara in lines 169-73 of the 2nd *taraṅga*.

<sup>3</sup> Neither the Ṭabaqāt nor Firishtah gives any indication of the date of Ḥaidar Shāh's death, nor does Śrīvara; but seeing that the death of Sultān Zain-ul-ʿābidin occurred in the month of *Jyaiṣṭha*, and Ḥaidar Shāh reigned for one year and two months, his death very probably took place in the month of *Śrāvana* in the year 878 A.H. or 1473 A.D.

<sup>4</sup> The heading is incorrect in both MSS. One gives the name as Sultān Ḥusain, the other omits the name altogether. I have adopted the heading in the lith. ed.

by the exertion of <sup>1</sup> Aḥmad Aswad. On the 10th day (after his accession) he imprisoned some people about whom he had suspicion. He <sup>2</sup> went away from Sikandarpūr to Naushahr, and took up his residence there. He gave away the treasures of his grandfather and uncle to (deserving) people; conferred the title of Malik Aḥmad on Aḥmad Aswad; and <sup>3</sup> entrusted the administration of the affairs to him; and made his son named Naurūz Aswad his chamberlain.

Bahrām Kḥān came out of Kashmir with his son; and went away towards Hindūstān. All his soldiers separated from him; and all his affairs will be narrated later. <sup>4</sup> The Sultān again revived all the rules and regulations of Sultān Zain-ul-'ābidīn which had been abolished in the time of Sultān Ḥaidar; and directed that all affairs should be carried out in conformity with them. At this time, some people, who wanted to create disturbances, went to Bahrām Kḥān; and incited him to declare war against the Sultān. The *amīrs* also wrote letters to him and summoned him. Bahrām Kḥān returning from

<sup>1</sup> The name is written as *أحمد ابلسو* and *أحمد ابلسو* in the MSS., and *محمد* *أمو* in the lith. ed. It is *أحمد أسود* in the lith. ed. of Firishtah, and Ahmud Ahoo in Col. Briggs' History (vol. IV, p. 477). Rodgers (*J.A.S.B.*, vol. LIV, p. 107) and the Cambridge History of India, page 286, call him Ahmad Aswad; and Rodgers has (the black) in brackets after Aswad. *أحمد أسو* has been adopted in the text-edition. Śrīvara in the 2nd *tarāṅga* of his *Rāja-taraṅgiṇī* calls him *अहमदायुक्तः* in line 178, and *आयुक्ताहमदमल्लेकः* in line 197. I cannot make out how *Āyukta* could be transformed into Aswad or *vice versa*. Aswad besides 'black' means 'powerful', 'illustrious'. Śrīvara describes the contention between Ḥasan Kḥān and Bahrām Kḥān about the succession; and then after it had been decided in favour of the former, describes the burial of Ḥaidar Shāh (lines 211 *et seq.* in the 2nd *tarāṅga*). This chapter he calls *हाव्यहैदरशहाव्यहत्तान्तवर्णनम्* ।

<sup>2</sup> Śrīvara in line 7 of the 3rd *tarāṅga* says—the Sultān left *शेकम्बरपुरी*, and went to his *पितामहविनिर्भित जैननगर*. Then he describes the coronation ceremonies, which were highly Hindu in their character, and in which *आहमदायुक्ती विधाय तिलकं खयं । सौवर्णकुसुमैः पूजामकरोन्नवभूपतेः* (l. 9); then there was *होमधूम* in the *अभिषेकक्रिया* (line 12).

<sup>3</sup> This is mentioned by Śrīvara in line 23; and the appointment of Aḥmad Aswad's son *नौरुजा* in the *दारपालादिकार्य* in line 25.

<sup>4</sup> See Śrīvara, line 33 in the 3rd *tarāṅga*, where he says *पितामहसमाचारं प्रावर्त्तयत मण्डले ।*

the district of <sup>1</sup> Karmā, arrived, after traversing the hills in the district of Karmā. The Sultān had at this time gone to <sup>2</sup> Walipūr on a pleasure trip. On hearing the news, he went to Suyyāpūr in order to fight with him. <sup>3</sup> Some people tried to persuade the Sultān to go away in the direction of India; but Malik Ahmad Aswad inciting him to fight, did not allow that he should retire towards India. The Sultān approved of the Malik's opinion and sent <sup>4</sup> Malik Tāj Bhat with a large army against Bahrām Khān. The latter had hoped that

<sup>1</sup> The name is كرمā Karmā in one MS. and looks like كارمā Karhā in the other. It is كرم, which cannot be clearly deciphered, in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has كرمار Karmar. The text-edition has كامراج Kamraj. Śrīvara in line 41 says कर्माभ्यन्तरतः मैलानुगच्छन् कटककोटः । क्रमराज्यपुरं प्रपन्नः क्रमराज्य-जिहोषया । which means that wishing to seize Kramarājya he arrived at Kramarājyapura from Karmābhyantara after crossing the hills. This is clear and agrees with the Ṭabaqāt except that we cannot find what Karmābhyantara means. Ordinarily it would mean from the interior of Karna, but I cannot find any locality of the name of Karna. Now taking the European authorities I find Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 477) says Beiram Khan came by the route of Kurmar; and Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 108) says he came "by way of the mountains to Kamraj"; while the Cambridge History of India, page 285, says he "took refuge in the hills of Kama to the west of Kamraj", and he apparently came from there. I cannot find anything about the Kama hills; and the names do not agree with that in the Persian chronicles or in Śrīvara's work.

<sup>2</sup> It appears from line 42 of the 3rd *taraiṅga* of Śrīvara's *Rājataraiṅgiṇī* that Ḥasan was at that time at Avantipura and he returned from there on hearing the news of the return of Bahrām. This probably indicates the identity of Avantipura now called Vantipor on the *Pūastā*, which was in old times probably the most important place in the district of Holadā, with Walipūr. Ḥasan's return to Suyyapūra is also mentioned in line 43. دیناپور Dīnāpūr in the text-edition.

<sup>3</sup> See Śrīvara, line 48, from which it appears that some of the leaders of the ministers said, तद्दत्त्वा कोशमासघोषितो गत्वा बहिस्ततः, though the sentence appears to be somewhat incomplete.

<sup>4</sup> The name is rather indistinct in one MS., but it is ملک تاج مهت in the other. The lith. ed. has ملک تاج لیب. Firishtah has only ملک تاج. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 478) has Mullik Taj Bhat. Neither Rodgers nor the Cambridge History of India gives the name of the commander of Ḥasan's army. Śrīvara in line 54 has सकिर्यडामरांसाजिभट्टदीन बहजन्नपः from which it appears that Tāji Bhaṭṭa or Tāj Bhat was the name of one of the commanders.

the Sultān's troops would come over to him; but in the end the contrary happened. There was a severe battle in a village of the name of <sup>1</sup> Dūlāpūr; and Bahrām Khān was defeated and fled, and came to the village of <sup>2</sup> Zainagir. The Sultān's troops hastened in pursuit of him and seized him. An arrow struck him on the face, and all his equipage and other things having been plundered, he was brought before the Sultān in a wretched condition. The Sultān ordered that both he and his son might be put into prison. After a time a blinding needle was drawn across his eyes, and after remaining in prison for <sup>3</sup> three years, he passed away from the world.

<sup>4</sup> Sultān Ḥasan (at this time) had Zain Badr, who had been the *vazīr* of Sultān Zain-ul-'ābidin and the rival of Malik Aḥmad Aswad,

<sup>1</sup> The name is لُولُو Lūlū, in one MS. and in the lith. ed. It is لُولُو in the other. Firishtah lith. ed. has تُولُو. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 478) has Looloopoor. لُولُو the reading in the first MS. is adopted in the text-edition. Neither Rodgers nor the Cambridge History of India gives the name of the place. Śrīvara in line 55 तावद्दहामखानस्तु प्राप दुलपुरान्नरं । Dulapura is so near Tūlapūr the name in Firishtah, that I have no doubt it is the correct name of the place where the battle took place, though I cannot find out anything about it. It may be that لُولُو is a corrupt form of Lōlau, the Kashmīri name of the *pargana* Lōlāb (see Stein, *Rājatarāṅgiṇī*, vol. II, p. 487).

<sup>2</sup> The name of the place is زینِکَر Zainkar in both MSS. and Ratankara in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has مرهه پور Marhanahpūr. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 478) has Zeinpoor. Neither Rodgers nor the Cambridge History of India furnishes any further light on the matter. Śrīvara in line 59 says अथ जैनगिरिं यावदाययौ तद्रणकुलः from which it would appear that he came to Jainagiri dismayed with the result of the battle. Jainagiri or the *pargana* of Zainagir appears to comprise "the fertile Karūwa tract between the Volur and the left bank of the Pohur River". (Stein, *Rājatarāṅgiṇī*, vol. II, p. 487).

<sup>3</sup> The MSS. and the lith. ed. have سه سال three years. Firishtah lith. ed., however, has سه روز three days and Col. Briggs and the Cambridge History of India following him have three days also. Rodgers (*J.A.S.B.*, vol. LIV, p. 108) says, "He remained in prison for three years after this and then died." The *Ṭabaqāt*, however, appears to be right, for Śrīvara in line 125 says इत्थं वर्षत्रयं तावदनुभूतमहाव्यथः । अस्थियेषतनुः क्लेशात्तस्मिन्नेव जयं ययौ ॥ i.e., there suffering great agonies for three years, and being reduced to a skeleton from his privations he died.

<sup>4</sup> This is also mentioned by Firishtah, almost in the same word as the *Ṭabaqāt*, but is not mentioned by Col. Briggs. It is mentioned by Rodgers,

and who had exerted himself in the matter of the blinding of Bahrām Khān, and whom Sultān Zain-ul-'ābidīn had on many occasions, owing to being annoyed with him, wanted to put to death, but had not been able to do so, seized. And it so happened that on the very day on which Bahrām Khān was deprived of his eye-sight, the needle was drawn across Zain Badr's eyes; and he also died in prison after three years.

Couplet:

Who'er in some one's eyes put the thorn of tyranny,  
It behoved that his own eyes were soon destroyed.

<sup>1</sup> Malik Aḥmad having now become the *vazīr* with full authority, sent Malik Yāri Bhat, who was his favourite with a large

who says that he was blinded with the same needle with which Bahrām Khān had just before been blinded. The Cambridge History of India does not mention the matter. It is mentioned by Śrīvara in lines 133 *et seq.* at some length and the particulars appear to agree with those in the Ṭabaqāt, but the name of the man does not agree with that given in the Ṭabaqāt or by Firishtah. M. Hidayat Ḥosain has adopted این بدر in the text-edition, but it was بزین بدر earlier on p. 678.

<sup>1</sup> The MSS. and the lith. ed. are rather obscure, and it is not quite clear whether Malik Yāri reinforced the Raja of Jammū or *vice versa*; and which of them invaded the Punjāb. Firishtah appears to say that Malik Yāri reinforced the army of the Rāja of Jammū who led the invasion of the Punjāb; and he looted the country, and devastated the city of Siālkōt. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 478) says that the invasion was undertaken at the instigation of the Raja of Jammoo, called Ajeet Dew, and that the latter took the command of the allied army, that he was defeated by Tatar Khan, who penetrated into Jammoo and sacked the town of Siālkote. Ho calls the commander of the Kashmir army Mullik Taj Bhut. Rodgers calls him Malik Bārī Bihut, and says he was sent to assist the Rājah of Jammū against Tātār Khān, who was harassing the borders of Kashmir; and that they plundered some part of the Punjāb, and destroyed the town of Siālkot. The Cambridge History of India, page 285, says that Hasan Shāh "sent an expedition under Malik Yāri Bhat, to co-operate with the troops of the Raja of Jammū in ravaging the northern districts of the Punjab, where Tātār Khan Lodī represented the military oligarchy over which his cousin Buhlūl presided at Dehli. The town of Siālkot was sacked, and Malik Yāri Bhat returned with as much plunder as enabled him to form a faction of his own." It does not say whether the Rāja of Jammū commanded or even accompanied the troops.

It will appear from the above, that there is great deal of discrepancy about the facts of this expedition. I am afraid Śrīvara's account does not clear it



army in the direction of the territory of Delhi by way of Rājauri: and 'Ajab Dēō the Rāja of Jammū came and met him, and reinforced him with an immense army. Malik Yāri advanced and fought with Tāṭār Khān, who was the governor, on behalf of the *Bādshāh* of Delhi, of the foot-hills of the Punjāb, and plundered the whole of his territory: and devastated the town of Siālkōt.

† The Sukān had a son by Hayāt Khatūn, who was a descendant of the Sairids. The Sultān gave him the name of Muhammad and entrusted him for his education to Malik Yāri Bhat. His 2<sup>d</sup> son was named Husain: and was entrusted to Malik Nūr, son of Malik Ahmad, so that he might bring him up. Some enmity having occurred between Malik Ahmad and Malik Yāri Bhat, they tried to destroy each other, and differences having also come about among the *amīrs*, there were 2<sup>d</sup> great battles, till one night (the *amīrs*?) collected their men, and getting into the palace of Sultān created

---





then crossed the river Bihut (Jhelum), and broke down the bridge; and collecting their men sat down on the other side of the river. Saiyid Muḥammad, son of Saiyid Ḥasan, who was the maternal uncle of the Sultān, collected his men and took up his quarters in the palace in order to guard him.

One of these nights, when a great disturbance was going on, and every one was in fear and distress, 1 'Abd Zinā wanted that he would take away Yūsuf Khān, son of Bahrām Khān, who was in prison. But one of the Saiyid *amirs* of the name of 'Alī Khān, becoming acquainted with the plan, slew Yūsuf Khān, and he also slew 2 Bāji Bhat, who was making lamentations at the murder of Yūsuf Khān. Yūsuf Khān's mother who was called 3 Sān Dēvi, who from the time when she had become a widow, did not eat more than three mouthfuls of barley meal when breaking her fast, kept watch for three days in her house over the coffin of her son; and after it had been buried, had a chamber built for herself near his mausoleum, and lived there till the time when she passed away.

In short Saiyid 'Alī Khān and the other Saiyids collected their retainers and sat down on the bank of the river in order to fight their enemies. They spent much money and collected an immense army. The people of Kashmir came from all directions in a large

1 The name looks like عېدى and عېدى in the MSS. and عېدى ربا in the lith. ed. Firishṭah lith. ed. has عېدى ربا. In the text edition it is عېدى ربا. Neither Col. Briggs nor Rodgers nor the Cambridge History of India gives the name. According to Srivara, Yūsuf Khān was killed by a man of the name of 'Alī Khān, when he was being taken away by some of his partisans who are described as यदरिजानकः (the exact meaning of which I cannot make out), who had released him from the prison (see lines 77-79 of the 4th *taraiṇā*).

2 The name is written as बाजी भट and बाजी भट in the MSS. and बाजी भट in the lith. ed. Firishṭah lith. ed. has बाजी भट. Srivara calls him बाजभट (4th *taraiṇā*, l. 83). It is बाजी भट in the text-edition.

3 The name is written as सान दीवी and सान दीवी in the MSS. and सान दीवी in the lith. ed. Firishṭah lith. ed. has सान दीवी. Srivara has सोबाण देवी (l. 88 of the 4th *taraiṇā*). The facts of her living on यवाक्ष and her living अजीवम् (without life) and in शयाक्षिरे (place of cremation) are also mentioned. M. Hidayat Ḥosain has adopted सान दीवी in the text-edition.

body and joined the latter. Skirmishes took place with arrows and muskets; and every day large numbers were slain on both sides. Robbers came into the city openly and plundered and looted. The Saiyids dug a trench round the city so that they might be safe from the robbers. They also razed to the ground the houses of their enemies in the city and the villages wherever they might be; and having plundered their property and cattle, did not, because of great pride, guard their own property. At this time, <sup>1</sup>Jahāngīr Mākri, who was at Loharkōt, came to the capital at the summons of the Kashmīri party, i.e., those opposed to the Saiyids. Although the Saiyids made overtures of peace to him he did not agree. One day Dāūd the son of Jahāngīr Mākri and <sup>2</sup>Saifi and Ankri crossed the bridge and fought with the Saiyids. Dāūd and most of his companions (they are called *Mukhālifān* i.e., enemies of the Saiyids) were killed. The Saiyids became <sup>3</sup>joyful, and beat drums and made minarets of the heads of their enemies. On another day the Saiyids went to cross the bridge. The enemies met them and there was a great fight near the middle of the bridge. Then the bridge <sup>4</sup>broke down, and many people of the two parties were drowned in the river.

<sup>1</sup> The invitation to Jahāngīr (जौमार्गेशज्यदांगिरं) is described in lines 137-42 of the 4th *tarāṅga*; and his arrival by पर्णात्समार्ग in line 145. The overtures of the Saiyids to him are mentioned in lines 147-154 and Jahāngīr's reply in 155-162. The Saiyids were angry on receiving the reply; and prepared for war (lines 163-165). Then मैफद रजोनराजानकादयः crossed the bridge and came to the capital to fight with the Saiyids (line 166).

<sup>2</sup> The names appear to be سیفی and انکری in the MSS., and in the lith. ed. of the Ṭabaqūt انکری and سیفی. In the lith. ed. of Firishtah there is only one name شق ما کری. Neither Col. Briggs nor Rodgers have any of the names mentioned in the Ṭabaqūt or in Firishtah. In the text-edition the name is سیفی دانکری. Dāūd is called दावोद, and his death is mentioned in line 178 of the 4th *tarāṅga*.

<sup>3</sup> I cannot find any mention of minarets being made of the heads of the slain but in line 190 it is said that the corpses were placed on the road दन्धन-गण्डान्य दन । Dāūd's head was also cut off and placed राजपथानरे (l. 187). The Saiyids also made विजयोद्धन वाद्यैः (l. 193).

<sup>4</sup> The breaking down of the bridge and the falling of मद्रादभारमग्राहाः शनमहुरः that day in the *Vīṭastā* is mentioned in line 196 of the 4th *tarāṅga*.



there the fire was extinguished. The number of the slain in the course of the day was two thousand. This happened in the year 892 A.H. Saiyid Muḥammad, son of Saiyid Ḥasan got into the house of a man named Gadāi of the 'Rāwat tribe, and fortified himself.

The enemies (i.e., the party opposed to the Saiyids) then all collected together in the palace or audience hall, and went to offer their homage to Muḥammad Shāh. They got him to join them, and he banished Saiyid 'Alī Khān and other Saiyids from Kashmīr. <sup>2</sup> They now sent back Parasrām after presenting him with various gifts. As everyone of the Kashmīris claimed to be the *sardār* (chief), in a very short time enmity made its appearance among them; and the administration of the government fell into confusion. <sup>3</sup> Fath Khān son of Ādam Khān, who after the death of Tātār Khān, had become the governor of the Panjāb arrived in Rajauri from Jālandar, and took up his quarters there in an endeavour to regain his ancestral dominions. As he was the grandson of Sultān Zain-ul-'ābidīn, <sup>4</sup> people, who sought for adventures among the *amīrs* and the Saiyids went to him in large numbers, and he giving rewards to each one of them gave them hopes (of further favours). He hoped that Jahāngīr Mākri would come before all others, and would see him; but Jahāngīr imagining that his enemies had gone before to see Fath Khān, did not join the latter; and dissuaded him from attempting to conquer Kashmīr.

Sultān Muḥammad Shāh came out of Kashmīr (i.e., Srinagar), being persuaded by Jahāngīr Mākri to do so; and encamped in the

---

whether that was burnt down or not. Firishtah also says that the number of persons slain that day was not less than ten thousand.

<sup>1</sup> The word is written as Rāwat in both MSS. In the lith. ed. and the text-edition it is Rāwan, while in the lith. ed. of Firishtah it is روات. In line 339 of the 4th *tarāṅga* of Śrīvara's *Itājatarāṅgiṇī* it is said that Miyan (मेय) Muḥammad got into सखिनिरान्तर.

<sup>2</sup> Śrīvara in line 347 says ययुः परशुरामाद्याः स्वदेगं प्राप्तमक्रियाः i.e., Parasurāma (Parasrām) and others went to their own country after receiving honours.

<sup>3</sup> The account of his birth, etc., is given by Śrīvara in lines 406-410 of the 4th *tarāṅga*.

<sup>4</sup> This is mentioned by Śrīvara in line 419 and the following lines. Then the negotiations between Fath Khān and Jahāngīr Mākri are described at some length.

plain of <sup>1</sup> Karsawār. Fath Khān also arrived in the neighbourhood of Aūdan by way of Hirpūr; and placing a spring of water between the two armies, settled down in front of the Sultān's army. Then the lines of the troops having been arranged, the flame of battle blazed up. At first Fath Khān made an onset, and it appeared probable that the Sultān's army would fall into disorder. But Jahāngir Mākri placing his feet firmly slew about fifty of the best men of Fath Khān's army; and that army being discomfited Fath Khān was about to be seized, when one of the enemies raised a (false cry), that Sultān Muḥammad Shāh had been taken prisoner by his enemies. Jahāngir becoming disturbed in his mind refrained from further pursuit of Fath Khān.

The Sultān came to Kashmīr, (i.e., Srinagar) after the victory, and sent Malik Yāri Bhat to ravage the villages, which had given shelter to Fath Khān. <sup>2</sup> Adam Khān and Fath Khān having disappeared for sometime again raised their heads in the neighbourhood of <sup>3</sup> Bahrāmgala; and for a second time having collected a number of men advanced to conquer Kashmīr. Jahāngir Mākri advanced with an immense army to meet them, and encamped in the village of <sup>4</sup> Gosawār in pargana Nāgām. Zirak, a servant of Fath Khān, availing himself of an opportunity, went into the city (Srinagar); and released the large number of amīrs who were in prison there.

---



Among them were Saifi and Ankri. Jahāngir was sorrowful at Saifi and Ankri having obtained their release, and <sup>1</sup> determined to make a treaty of peace with Fath Khān. He sent a message to the Rāja of Rājauri, by whose help Fath Khan had invaded the country that he might create disaffection in Fath Khān's army. The Rāja of Rājauri and other *amīrs* separated from Fath Khān, and joined Jahāngir. Fath Khān in great dismay turned back, and Jahāngir pursued him as far as Hirahpūr. Fath Khān went to Jammū and conquered it; and bringing great army from that country again advanced to conquer Kashmir.

<sup>2</sup> Jahāngir now gave assurances of safety to the Saiyids, whom he had before this banished from the country, and summoned them; and a great battle took place between the Sultān and Fath Khān. Saifi and Ankri on the side of the latter fought with great gallantry; and on the side of the Sultān the Saiyids made fine efforts, and behaved with great bravery and courage. <sup>3</sup> A large number of them attained to martyrdom, and the rest who survived obtained the confidence of the Sultān and Jahāngir. On this occasion Fath Khān was defeated and retired. But he again collected an immense army and invaded Kashmir; and after fighting several battles, became victorious.

Couplet:

If the flower of joy thou seekest, from the thorn of sorrow  
draw not thy skirt;

If treasure thou seekest, thy foot into the mouth of the serpent  
place.

lith. ed. of Firishtah. In the text-edition it is *کبصار* Khaswār. Various names are mentioned by Śrīvara in lines describing this meeting, but I cannot find any which at all resembles any of the names mentioned in the MSS. of the Ṭabaqāt or the lith. ed. of the Ṭabaqāt and of Firishtah; but in line 598 the battle is called the battle of *Gusikodhāra* (गुसिकाद्वार). (See also Stein's *Rājatarāṅgiṇī*, vol. II, p. 474 and also note 1 on p. 687).

<sup>1</sup> The meaning is not clear. The MSS. as well as the lith. ed. of the Ṭabaqāt and of Firishtah all say *خاں نمود* *خاں نمود*; but apparently it was only a stratagem, and there was no real intention of making a treaty with Fath Khān.

<sup>2</sup> This is mentioned by Śrīvara in line 570 of the 4th *tarāṅga* of his *Rājatarāṅgiṇī*.

<sup>3</sup> See line 596 of the 4th *tarāṅga*.



religious teacher; and all the endowments and property of the religious establishment of Dēvharah were allotted to his disciples; and his Sūfī followers endeavoured to ruin and destroy all the temples of the *Kāfirs*; and no one dared to forbid them. In a short time disputes arose among the *amīrs* and they came to the palace and slew one another. <sup>1</sup> Malik Ajhī and Zīnā, who were among the chief *amīrs* of Fath Khān, combined with a number of others, and taking Sultān Muḥammad Shāh out of prison, brought him to Bārāmūla; but as they did not find any marks of wisdom in him, they repented of what they had done, and wanted to seize him again, and surrender him to Fath Khān. Muḥammad Shāh having got information of this, made his escape one night to another place.

After that, <sup>2</sup> Sultān Fath Shāh divided the country of Kashmīr into three equal parts, among himself and Malik Ajhī and Sankar; and made Malik Ajhī, the *vazīr* with full powers, and Sankar the *Dīwān* or revenue officer of the whole territory (*Dīwān-i-kul*). Malik Ajhī had wonderful skill in the decision of cases. Among the cases was this: two men had a dispute about an <sup>3</sup> invoice of fine silk.

and says that in a short time the people of Kashmīr specially the Chaks became his disciples; and some, who were ignorant, and did not understand his esoteric doctrines, became *mulāhids* or heretics, after his death. For other accounts of his doctrines see the *Tarikh-i-Rashidi* (Elias and Ross, pp. 435-436).

<sup>1</sup> The names are written as ملک اچھی و دنا and ملک اچھی و ران تا in the MSS. and ملک اچھی و رنیا in the lith. eds. of the *Tabaqāt* and *Firishtah* respectively. In the text-edition the names are ملک اچھی و رینا. I cannot find any name in Prājyabhaṭṭa's *Rājatarāṅgiṇī* which at all resembles them but see the next note from which it appears that Malik Ajhī was called मल्लिकोज्ज्वल.

<sup>2</sup> See lines 70 of Prājyabhaṭṭa's *Rājatarāṅgiṇī* from which it appears that one share was allotted to Fath Shāh (फताहशाह), another to Malik Ajhī (मल्लिकोज्ज्वल), and the third to Shankar (राजानशङ्कर). The reason of this division is not at all easy to discover. It also appears from line 73 that उत्तममल्लिक had the सुख्य मन्त्रिपद and राजानशङ्कर had the सिद्धादेश.

<sup>3</sup> The words are برسر پیچک باریک ابریشم, Col. Briggs does not mention the matter. Rodgers says that the dispute was about a bale of silk. پیچک in the dictionary is said to mean an invoice, a list. But this meaning does not quite fit in with the context, where the judge is said to have inquired whether the پیچک had been wound with the finger, or on his finger. In the text-edition M. Hidayat Ḥosain has برسر پیچک.



occasion the period of Sultān Muḥammad's reign was nine months and nine days <sup>1</sup>.

Sultān Fath Shāh again took possession of Kashmīr, and made <sup>2</sup> Jahāngīr, who was of the tribe of Badrah his *vazīr* and Sankar Zinā his revenue minister (*Dīwān-i-kul*). He ruled justly. Muḥammad Shāh after his defeat went to <sup>3</sup> Iskandar Kakhar, and the latter sent a large force to help him. Jahāngīr Badrah was also aggrieved with Sultān Fath Shāh, and joined Muḥammad Shāh; and brought the latter into Kashmīr by way of <sup>4</sup> Rājaurī. Sultān <sup>5</sup> Fath Shāh made Jahāngīr Mākri the commander of the vanguard of his army; and sent him to oppose Muḥammad Shāh. But his army was defeated, and <sup>6</sup> Jahāngīr Mākri together with his son was killed in the battle; and some chief *amīrs* of his such as 'Alī Shāh Bēgi and others joined Muḥammad Shāh. Sultān Fath Shāh being utterly helpless fled to Hindūstān, and died there. <sup>7</sup> His rule this time lasted for one year and one month.

Sultān Muḥammad Shāh sat on the seat of authority again for the third time, and had the kettledrums beaten. <sup>8</sup> He imprisoned

<sup>1</sup> See line 99 of Prājyabhaṭṭa's *Rājatarāṅgiṇī*.

<sup>2</sup> See line 100 of Prājyabhaṭṭa's *Rājatarāṅgiṇī*. This Jahāngīr is called in it प्रतीहारव्यवहार; and Sankar Jina is called राजानप्रहार. I cannot find anything about *Pratīhara* or *Rājānaśṛṅgāra*.

<sup>3</sup> One MS. and the lith. ed. have اسکندر ککھر Iskandar Kakhar; the other MS. اسکندر کاکي Iskandar Kākī. Firishtah lith. ed., however, says that he went نرد شاه سکندر شاه لودھی بادشاه دہلی; and he is followed by Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 489) and Rodgers (*J.A.S.B.*, vol. LIV, p. 111). The Cambridge History of India is silent on this point, and so is Prājyabhaṭṭa's *Rājatarāṅgiṇī*.

<sup>4</sup> One MS. and the lith. ed. have از راه حوری, but the other MS. has از راه را جوری, which is correct, and which I have adopted. Firishtah lith. ed., also has از راه را جوری. The return of Muḥammad Shāh is described in lines 120–125 of Prājyabhaṭṭa's *Rājatarāṅgiṇī*.

<sup>5</sup> Compare line 127, which says that Fath Shāh advanced from the capital to fight Muḥammad Shāh, aided by only one of his ministers प्रतीहारव्यवहार.

<sup>6</sup> These facts are mentioned by Firishtah, who, however, calls 'Alī Shāh Bākī, 'Alī Shāh Bēg, but they do not appear to be mentioned in Prājyabhaṭṭa's *Rājatarāṅgiṇī*.

<sup>7</sup> Compare line 130 of Prājyabhaṭṭa's *Rājatarāṅgiṇī*.

<sup>8</sup> Compare lines 135, 136. Kāji Chak is called चक्रेशकाशन in line 136. He is also called कचचक्र elsewhere (see l. 194).

Sankar, who was among the great and trusted *amīrs* of Fath Shāh, and selected Kājī Chak, who was noted for his wisdom and bravery, to be his *razār*. This man had wonderful cleverness in the decision of disputes. Among the disputes one was this: A writer had a wife. It so happened that he remained at a distance from her for some time. The woman in her passions married a second husband. After a time the writer again appeared; and there was a dispute between him and the second husband (of his wife). They appeared before Kājī Chak. As neither of them had any witnesses in support of his claim, the decision of the matter appeared to be difficult. At last Malik Kājī Chak said to the woman, "You are telling the truth, and the writer is a liar. Come, pour a little water into this inkstand of mine, so that I may write a bond (judgement ?) for you, so that he may have no further dealings with you. The woman got up, and put as much water in the inkstand as was required. The Malik said, "Pour more". Again she put a little water, so that it might not spill the ink; and in doing so she showed the greatest caution. The Malik said to those who were present, "From the great caution shown by the woman, it is evident that she is the wife of the writer." In the end she also acknowledged it, and the dispute was settled.

As the government of Sultān Muḥammad acquired greater stability, he ordered the execution of most of the *amīrs* of Fath Shāh, such as <sup>1</sup> Saifī, Ankri, and others; and Sankar Zinā died a natural death. The servants of Fath Shāh brought his dead body from India. Sultān Muḥammad Shāh went forward to meet it and ordered it to be buried in the neighbourhood of the tomb of Sultān Zain-ul-'ābidīn. These events happened in the year 922 A.H. (1516 A.D.).

In the same year, Sultān Sikandar Lūdī, the *Bādshāh* of Dehli, died; and his son Ibrāhīm sat on the throne. At this time Malik Kājī imprisoned <sup>2</sup> Ibrāhīm Mākri. Abdāl Mākri, the son of the

<sup>1</sup> Compare lines 165, 166 where the execution of सैफदामरेन्द्रादि is mentioned in the first and the death of राजानशङ्कर, or rather his following Fath Shāh to the grave owing to the great love he bore him are mentioned in the second.

<sup>2</sup> Compare line 171 of Prājyabhaṭṭa's *Rājatarāṅgiṇī*, from which it appears that Ibrāhīm Mākri is there called दोसरजानक. He is, however, called यत्राक्षुष्यति

latter, in concert with some people from Hindūstān, made Iskandar Khān a claimant for the throne, and brought him to Kashmīr. Sultān Muḥammad and Malik Kājī advanced to meet them in battle at <sup>1</sup> Lūlpūr in *pargana* Bāngil. <sup>2</sup> Iskandar Khān not having the power to meet them retired into the fort of Nākām. Malik Kājī besieged the fort; and <sup>3</sup> for some days there were skirmishes between the two parties. <sup>4</sup> At this time, a number of the *amīrs* of the Sultān rebelled against him, and went to Iskandar Khān. Malik Kājī sent his son named Mas'ūd to attack them; and he fighting bravely against them was slain, but the victory remained on his side, Iskandar Khān left the fort of Nākām and escaped; and the Malik entered it. The Mākris in distress and disorder followed Iskandar Khān; and Sultān Muḥammad Shāh returned to the city joyful and happy. These events happened in the year 931 A.H. (1524 A.D.).

It was in that year, that His Majesty, Firdūs Makānī Bābar *Bādshāh* attacked Ibrāhīm Lūdī, and slew him in the battle of Panīpat. At this time the disposition of Muḥammad Shāh at the insinuations of his enemies turned against Malik Kājī <sup>5</sup>. He became suspicious, went to Rājaurī and made the Rājas of the various parts of the

in line 173; and his sons सल्लोकान्दलकाद्याः are said to have brought फतिहशाहजं खानमेखन्दरामिधं from outside Kashmīr (बाह्यात्) (l. 174).

<sup>1</sup> The name is written as लुलपूर, and लुलोपूर in the MSS. and as بوهور in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has نون پور پرگنه ماعکل, but the name is not very distinct. Prājyabhaṭṭa's *Rājataranīṅī*, line 175, has लोलपुरोद्धारम्. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 490) calls the place Alwurpoor in Fankul district; and Rodgers (*J.A.S.B.*, vol. LIV, p. 112), apparently following Firishtah, has Nolpin in the *parganna* of Māhekal. The name of the *pargana* is بالکل, or بالکل in the MSS. and लल in the lith. ed. of the *Ṭabaqāt*. The correct name is Bāngil (No. 31 in the list of Kashmīr *parganas* on page 494 of Stein's *Rājataranīṅī*, Vol. II).

<sup>2</sup> Compare line 176 of Prājyabhaṭṭa's *Rājataranīṅī*.

<sup>3</sup> Compare line 178 of Prājyabhaṭṭa's *Rājataranīṅī*.

<sup>4</sup> The account in Prājyabhaṭṭa's *Rājataranīṅī* is somewhat different. It is said there that प्रतीहारपति च्छाङ्गेर with others (who were the rebels) entered the fort of Luhara; and the Cakrapa, i.e. Kājī Chak, finding two armies on his two sides (जहाधः सद्दिनं शत्रुसैन्यम्), sent his son ससोदचक्र to attack Luhara (lines 179, 180). The fight of Masa'ud's army with the Lohara garrison and Masa'ud's death are described in lines 182-190.

<sup>5</sup> This appears to be mentioned in line 218 of Prājyabhaṭṭa's *Rājataranīṅī*.

country obedient to himself. At this time Iskandar Khān, who had gone away, after being defeated by the Sultān, came back with a <sup>1</sup> number of Mughals; and took possession of Lōharkōt. <sup>2</sup> Malik Yāri, brother of Malik Kāji, hearing of it went and attacked him; and having fought with him, seized him, and sent him to the Sultān. The Sultān, being pleased with Malik Kāji on account of his loyal services, again entrusted the post of the *vazārat* to him. <sup>3</sup> He had Iskandar's eyes blinded by drawing the needle across them.

At this time Ibrāhīm Khān, son of Sultān Muḥammad Shāh, who had gone with his father to Sultān Ibrāhīm Lūdī, when the latter had furnished Sultān Muḥammad Shāh with a large army, and had given him permission to return to Kashmīr, but had kept Ibrāhīm Khān in his service, came to Kashmīr owing to the catastrophe which had overtaken Sultān Ibrāhīm Lūdī. Malik Kāji, who was annoyed with the Sultān on account of his having blinded Iskandar Khān, put him and his immediate attendants, by every pretext that he could think of, into prison. After having imprisoned him, <sup>4</sup> he raised Ibrāhīm Khān to the throne.

<sup>1</sup> Firishtah says that these Mughals belonged to, or were sent by Firdūs Makānī Zahir-ud-din Muḥammad Bābar *Bādshāh*.

<sup>2</sup> He is called Tājacakra in line 230, in which it is said that he and his other heroic brothers slew the Mughals in a battle in लोहरादिपु ।

<sup>3</sup> This is mentioned in lines 236, 237 in Prājyabhatṭa's *Rājatarāṅgiṇī*.

<sup>4</sup> The matter of the deposition of Muḥammad Shāh, मल्लोदशादस।चाञ्चभङ्ग, as it is called in Prājyabhatṭa's *Rājatarāṅgiṇī*, begins in line 246, where the author exclaims on the strange act of Providence (विधातुः) by which Muḥammad Shāh lost his kingdom by the act of his own son. In line 248 it is said that on Ibrāhīm Lūdī's defeat, Ibrāhīm Khān came to Kashmīr, cherished by his father's affection (पितृस्नेहविवर्द्धित). In the following line, it appears that Kāji Chak's evil intention towards the Sultān made its appearance on account of his wish to seize the kingdom (राज्यजिह्वोपेय); and he in his anger cast the राजान्तराजान् मल्लेकलदभट्टादीन् into prison; and from line 252 it appears that the चक्रराज, swallowed up the मल्लोदशादभानु, i.e., the sun called Muḥammad Shāh. It would appear, therefore, that, according to the chronicle, it is not true that Kāji Chak cast Muḥammad Shāh into prison, because he was annoyed with him for having caused Sikandar Khān to be blinded, but he did so to gratify his own ambition. It is true that the chronicler after stating the fact moralises, that धर्मः फलति कालेन सद्यःपाको हि सोऽभवत् । खानस्यान्याद्वाथा यामूदराज्यभग्नपुत्रस्य स (l. 254).



The period of the reign of Muḥammad Shāh was, on this occasion, <sup>1</sup> eleven years and eleven months and eleven days.

AN ACCOUNT OF SULTĀN IBRĀHIM SHĀH, SON OF MUḤAMMAD SHĀH.

<sup>2</sup> When he sat on the throne, he made Malik Kāji his permanent *vazīr* according to previous custom. <sup>3</sup> Abdāl Mākri son of Ibrāhīm Mākri, who had gone to India to escape the tyranny of Malik Kāji, having at this time entered the service of His Majesty Firdūs Makāni, submitted to him, that he had sought an asylum at that threshold, from the violence of his enemies. If His Majesty would help that slave with an army, he would conquer Kashmīr for the servants of His Majesty in the easiest possible way. His Majesty, <sup>4</sup> after obtaining the necessary information, about his appearance and character, said in kind language, that <sup>5</sup> even in jungles such men could be met with. He honoured Abdāl Mākri with the gift of a horse and a robe of honour, and detached <sup>6</sup> a large number of troops to accompany him. He made <sup>7</sup> Shaikh 'Alī Bēg and Muḥammad Khān and Maḥmūd Khān the commanders of the detachment.

<sup>1</sup> This agrees with Firishtah and Rodgers (*J.A.S.B.*, vol. LIV, p. 113); but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 491) says that Mahomed had reigned for nineteen years, when he was deposed, but it is not clear whether this was the period of his reign in the third term. Prājyabhaṭṭa's *Rājataranginī* (l. 253) makes it eleven years, ten months and ten days (एकादशब्दान् दश मासान् दिनानि च).

<sup>2</sup> Compare lines 257 and 258 of Prājyabhaṭṭa's *Rājataranginī*.

<sup>3</sup> Compare line 260 of Prājyabhaṭṭa's *Rājataranginī* where Bābar is called दिल्लीपं सुगुलेश्वरम् ।

<sup>4</sup> This is stated by Prājyabhaṭṭa as चाकारेद्धितवाक्चेष्टासम्पूर्णं वीक्ष्य मार्गपं । चणं तुषकाराजोऽभूद्विस्मयानतकन्धरः । (l. 261) from which it would appear, that Bābar was greatly impressed by what he saw of and heard from Abdāl Mākri.

<sup>5</sup> It is rather difficult to understand the mention of jungles but Firishtah also has the same word. The idea probably is that Bābar was probably surprised that a country like Kashmīr, which he thought was covered by forests, could produce such a fine-looking and able man. As the *Rājataranginī*, in the line I have quoted, says, he lowered his head in astonishment.

<sup>6</sup> Prājyabhaṭṭa's *Rājataranginī* (l. 262) says सद्यस्सङ्गा वीराणां सेनास्ये प्रतिपादिता ।

<sup>7</sup> All the three names appear in both MSS. and in the lith. ed; but Firishtah lith. ed. omits the second name, and he is, of course, followed by Col. Briggs and Rodgers. Prājyabhaṭṭa's *Rājataranginī* (l. 265) also has the first and third

As Abdāl Mākri perceived, that the Kashmiris would <sup>1</sup> hate the coming of the Mughals, he advanced towards Kashmir, having, for political reasons, given the name of Sultān to <sup>2</sup> Nāzuk Shāh, son of Fath Shāh. On the other side, Malik Kāji took Ibrāhīm Shāh with him; and made the village of <sup>3</sup> Sullāh in the *pargana* of Bāngil his camping ground. The two armies encamped in front of each other. Abdāl Mākri sent the following message to Malik Kāji. <sup>4</sup> "I waited on Bābar *Bādshāh*, and have brought reinforcements from him. The power and grandeur of that *Bādshāh* are so great, that he made Sultān Ibrāhīm, the *Bādshāh* of Delhi, who had five hundred thousand men, in the winking of an eye, like the dark dust. Your welfare lies in this that you should come into the band of his loyal adherents. But if this great fortune is not in your lot, come quickly and fight with this army. There is no time left for remedy or hesitation." Malik Kāji made <sup>5</sup> Saiyid Ibrāhīm Khān and Sarang and Malik Yārī the

names, which it transforms, almost beyond recognition into शिखासभेग and सफ़ोद खान ।

<sup>1</sup> Rodgers (*J.A.S.B.*, vol. LIV, p. 113) I think, quite incorrectly translates the words تنفر خوامند جست by the words "would despise".

<sup>2</sup> Firishtah lith. ed. incorrectly calls Nāzuk Shāh, the son of Ibrāhīm, and he is followed by Col. Briggs and by Rodgers. The Cambridge History of India, page 287, agrees with the *Ṭabaqāt*, and calls him the second son of Fath Shāh. Prājyabhaṭṭa's *Rājatarāṅgiṇī* (l. 266) has फतादशादजं खानं नाजोकश्चापययिनम् ।

<sup>3</sup> Both MSS. and the lith. eds. of the *Ṭabaqāt* and of Firishtah have در موضع. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 492) has "Sullah in the district of Fankul" and Rodgers (*J.A.S.B.*, vol. LIV, p. 113) has "Sulah in the *pargana* of Bānkul". The Cambridge History of India, III, page 287 says the battle took place at Naushahra (Nowshera), but does not give any authority. According to Prājyabhaṭṭa (l. 267) the Cakrapa, i.e., Qāḍī Chak, placed his army at Nilūsva. The place is mentioned in various places of Kalhana's *Rājatarāṅgiṇī* as a district of Kashmir. In the text-edition نکل is changed to ما نکل, while in the English translation, following Stein (vol. II, p. 481), Bāngil has been adopted.

<sup>4</sup> A part of this adjuration of Abdāl Mākri appears in lines 269–271 of Prājyabhaṭṭa's *Rājatarāṅgiṇī*.

<sup>5</sup> The commanders are called रक्षाखान सेरदमेर and सल्लेक नाजक in line 273; and those of the other army are called सल्लेकलुहर, रिगचक्रेश सल्लेक and

commanders of three detachments, and began the battle. A great fight took place between the two armies, and many were slain. And of the renowned nobles of Ibrāhīm Shāh, Yāri Chak, and Sarang and others, each of whom had large number of followers, were slain. Malik Kājī in great distress fled to the city. but he could not stay there also; and went away towards the hilly country. Nothing is known about Ibrāhīm Shāh, as to what happened to him, and where he went.

The period of his rule was eight months and twenty-five days.

#### AN ACCOUNT OF <sup>1</sup>NĀZUK SHĀH, SON OF FATH SHĀH.

After the victory, <sup>2</sup> he ascended the throne in the city of Srinagar, and gave assurances of safety to the Kashmiris, who were afraid and suspicious of the Mughals. The Kashmiris then made rejoicings at his accession. And he then left the city, and took up his abode in Nau Shahr, which from ancient time was the capital of the Sultāns. He selected Abdāl Mākri to be his *vazīr* and representative (*vakīl*). Abdāl went as far as the <sup>3</sup> country of Jamalnagarī in pursuit of Malik Kājī; but whom he found that it would be impossible to seize him, he commenced to make a division of the country. Leaving aside the *Khālṣa* or the crown lands, the country was divided into

शिविमिग which are probably identical with Malik Lōhar and Malik Rāgi Chak; and शिविमिग seems to be another form of शिखालबग the name of Shaikh 'Alī Bēg. See the latter part of note 7, pages 696. 697. The battle is described with some spirit in line 275 and the following lines and the death of Yāri Chak (called रलक ताजक) is mentioned in line 282, and that of Sarang in the next line. The flight of Qādī Chak to the city is mentioned in line 284. In the text-edition سرمك has been adopted in place of سرنگ.

<sup>1</sup> He is also sometimes called Nādir Shāh, as the name is Nādir on all his coins (Rodgers, *J.A.S.B.*, vol. LIV, p. 114) but all the histories call him Nāzūk Shāh.

<sup>2</sup> Compare lines 285–287 of Prājyabhaṭṭa.

<sup>3</sup> The words are نگرى تا سواد جہل نگرى or نگرى تا سواد جہل نگرى in the MSS. and in the lith. eds. of the *Ṭabaqāt* and of *Firishtah*. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 492) has "The town of K'hulnagry", and Rodgers (*J.A.S.B.*, vol. LIV, p. 114) has "the confines of Jahalnagarī". In line 288 of Prājyabhaṭṭa it is stated that गता जमालनगरां सट्टपास्तेष्व सन्निष्ठाः though it is not said there, that they went there in pursuit of Malik Qādī. In the text-edition it is जहल नگرى.

four shares. <sup>1</sup> One share was allotted to Abdāl Mākri, the second to Mīr 'Alī, the third to Lōhar Mākri and the remaining to one of the Chaks. Abdāl Mākri then sent back the servants of Firdūs Makānī to Hindūstān, after giving them many presents and valuable gifts. They sent an angry message to Malik Kāji, and summoned Muḥammad Shāh to come to them; <sup>2</sup> and going to Mīr 'Alī, brought Muḥammad Shāh out of the fort of Lōharkōt; and they all came together to Kashmīr (i.e., Srinagar). They did not permit Malik Kāji to come.

Sultān Muḥammad Shāh then sat for the fourth time on the throne, and he made Nāzuk Shāh, <sup>3</sup> who had governed the country for twenty years, his successor. At this time His Majesty Firdūs Makānī departed from this transitory world; and His Majesty Jinnat Ashīānī Muḥammad Humāyūn *Bādshāh* sat on the throne of the empire. This happened in

<sup>1</sup> The division is mentioned by Firishtah and Rodgers, with some differences and also in Prājyabhaṭṭa's *Rājatarāṅgiṇī*, lines 288, 289; but no one gives any reason for the division. The division as given in Prājyabhaṭṭa's *Rājatarāṅgiṇī* agrees with that in the *Ṭabaqāt*, the four shares being allotted in it respectively to मल्लिकाजक, चालेमेर, मारिगलदुर and रिगचक्र। It is curious that, according to Mirza Haidar Dughlāt (page 441, Elms and Ross's translation of the *Tarikh-i-Rashidi*), he found the following four Maliks in Kashmir; "Abdāl Makri, Kājichak, Lāhur Makri and Yakehak." Three of these names appear to agree with those who got three of the shares. The fourth चालेमेर or Ali Mīr had been killed in an engagement with the Mirza himself.

<sup>2</sup> Firishtah's account is somewhat different. According to him Shaikh Mīr 'Alī went to Lōharkōt and brought Muḥammad Shāh with him. According to Rodgers (*J.A.S.B.*, vol. LIV, p. 114) Abdāl Mākri recalled Muḥammad Shāh "from his prison of Loharkot" and the two, i.e., Abdāl and Muḥammad Shāh entered Kashmīr as friends. This does not appear to me to be quite correct. Prājyabhaṭṭa in lines 290-296 mentions the message sent to the Cakreśa, the sending back of the Mughals, and the going of 'Alī Mīr to Muḥammad Shāh.

<sup>3</sup> Firishtah says he had governed the country for twenty years and eight months. Rodgers (*J.A.S.B.*, vol. LIV, p. 114) has "20 years and 20 months"; the number of months is of course incorrect. Prājyabhaṭṭa in line 298 has राज्यं कृत्वाय वर्षेकं दशम्यां नाजिको नृपः। ज्यैष्ठ्यं मूलो नृपात् प्राप यौवराज्यं महम्मदात्। i.e., the King Nājika (Nazuk) having reigned for one year, obtained the position of heir apparent from King Muḥammad. The period of Nāzuk's reign certainly was not twenty years; he ascended the throne in 933 A.H., 1537 A.D., and was deposed and made heir apparent, in 935 A.H., 1529 A.D., so he reigned for a little more than a year as stated by Prājyabhaṭṭa.

the year 937 A.H. When one year of the reign of Sultān <sup>1</sup> Nāzuk Shāh had elapsed, Malik Kājī Chak, who had gone to the hilly country collected a vast number of men there, and came to the neighbourhood of <sup>2</sup> Kahrār. Malik Abdāl came and confronted him, and fought with him. Malik Kājī fled and went to Hindūstān.

At this time, Mīrzā Kāmran had absolute power on the Punjāb. Shaikh 'Alī Bēg, Muḥammad Khān and Maḥmūd Khān, <sup>3</sup> who had, after the conquest of Kashmīr returned with the permission of Abdāl Mākri, represented to Mīrzā Kāmran, "As we have acquired a knowledge of the whole country of Kashmīr, if you pay a little attention, the whole country can be conquered with the greatest ease." <sup>4</sup> Mīrzā Kāmran appointed Maḥram Bēg to be the commander of his army, and sent him to conquer Kashmīr in concert with the nobles who had joined them. When the Mughal army arrived in the neighbourhood of Kashmīr, the inhabitants in great terror left all their property and things in their houses, and fled towards the hills. The Mughal army

<sup>1</sup> Both MSS. and the lith. ed. have Nāzuk Shah, but this is clearly a mistake. Firishtah has از شاهی محمد شاه, i.e., of the reign of Muḥammad Shāh, which is correct.

<sup>2</sup> Both the MSS. and the lith. ed. of Firishtah have كهرار Kahrār. The lith. ed. of the Ṭabaqāt has پنجرار Punjhrār. Rodgers (*J.A.S.B.*, vol. LIV, p. 114) has Kahrār. Prājyabhaṭṭa has सप्तमेन्द्रध्वजैः सार्धं युद्धेच्छुः काचचक्रपः । मौर्वारग्रामादगमत् सवेनोद्य दिगन्तरम् (l. 301) which does not, however, make one much wiser as to the locality.

<sup>3</sup> Rodgers (*J.A.S.B.*, vol. LIV, p. 114) says, "Shaikh Ali Beg and Muhammad Khān the leaders of the allies who had helped Abdāl Mākari, and who had left him without permission." This is totally incorrect. As a matter of fact they were sent back with many presents and valuable gifts. In the particular passage under translation both Nizām-ud-dīn and Firishtah say باخت and not بخصت. In the text-edition it is بخصت.

<sup>4</sup> This is mentioned by Prājyabhaṭṭa (l. 303) Maḥram Bēg being transformed into महामाख्यसमृपतिः and Mīrzā Kāmran into मेरेज-कासराण and the following facts are mentioned (lines 304-308) that शिखलभिग, महोदखान and other Mughals accompanied the Mughal army; that Muḥammad Shāh and others quickly brought back the *Cakreśa*, i.e., Qādi Chak to help him, that the Mughals having invaded the city with thousands of horses and elephants, the Kashmīris took shelter in the fort, and the Mughals burnt down and looted the houses and cities, etc.

then looted the city, and set fire to it. Some of the *Kashmīrīs* who had returned from the hills to fight with the *Mughals* were slain. *Abdāl Mākri* had a conviction at first that *Malik Kāji*; was with the *Mughals*; but when he knew at last of a certainty, that he was not with them, he showed friendship and attachment towards him; and summoned him with his sons and brothers; and they made promises and bound one another by oaths. This became a source of strength for the *Kashmīrīs*; and they set their heart on a battle; and combined together and engaged the *Mughals* in a big fight. <sup>1</sup>The latter, considering it advisable to do so, went back to their own country.

<sup>2</sup> After some time, *Malik Kāji*, having seen the treachery and pride of *Malik Abdāl*, did not consider it desirable to remain in the country and went to *Hindūstān*. <sup>3</sup> It was in this year, that is, in 939 A.H., that *Sultān Saiyid Khān*, the *Bādekhān* of *Kāshghar*, sent his son *Sisāndar Khān*, in company with *Mirzā Haidar Kāshgharī*,

hidden themselves, and slew them and took them prisoners. This state of things went on for <sup>1</sup> three months.

And Malik Kāji Chak and Malik Abdāl Mākri and other renowned *sardārs* went to and took shelter in <sup>2</sup> Chakdhar; but as they did not consider it advisable to remain there, <sup>3</sup> they descended from the mountains in the direction of Khāwaryārah, and having resolved

<sup>1</sup> Rodgers (*J.A.S.B.*, vol. LIV, p. 115) contrary to both Nizām-ud-dīn and Firishtah has six months. Prājyabhaṭṭa (l. 325) also says that the Kashmir chiefs fought with the *Mlecchas* for three months.

<sup>2</sup> The name is written as چکدر in both MSS., and as چکومر in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has چکدر. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 494) has "the town of Chukdura," and Rodgers (*J.A.S.B.*, vol. LIV, p. 115) has Chakdara; but no attempt has been made by anybody to identify the place, and I also have not been at all successful. Prājyabhaṭṭa (l. 324) has जलावरण-युक्तासु भूपभूमिषु शिबियुः। काश्मीरिकासहनाया आश्रयान् खेच्छगङ्गया, i.e., the commanders of the Kashmir army, fearing the *Mlecchas*, obtained asylum in the *Bhūpabhūmis* (whatever they might be) which were covered with water; but I have no idea as to what the *Bhūpabhūmis* were and where they were situated. The next line, however, mentions three places, Ciroddāra, Hājyeṅgakotta and Cakradhara, but the line goes on to say युत्ताम्यवाहयन् मासत्रयं खेच्छैः प्रयुध्य वे। If युत्ता is a mistake for यित्ता, then the line would mean that taking shelter in Ciroddāra, Hājyeṅgakotta and Cakradhara, they carried on the war with the *Mlecchas* for three months; and then Chakdara or Chakdhar would probably be Cakradhara; but unfortunately I cannot find anything about Cakradhara also; and I cannot alter *Srutrā* to *Sytrā*. In the text-edition it is چکدر.

<sup>3</sup> The readings here are different. One MS. has بجانب كهارة و از انجا, بجانب كهارة و از انجا براه ماوة فرود آمدند, the other has بجانب كهارة و از انجا براه ماربادة از كوة فرود آمدند, while the lith. ed. has بجانب كهادرارة و از انجا براه باده از كوة فرود آمدند. Firishtah lith. ed. has بجانب كهادرارة و از انجا براه باده از كوة فرود آمدند. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 494) has (they) "retreated to Baramoola living occasionally in the hills." Rodgers says that from Chakdara "they went to Khāwara and Bāradār. From this place by the way of Bādah they descended from the mountains." Prājyabhaṭṭa does not give much help. He says (l. 330), चक्राधारादेव भूपेन्द्रयुक्ता भीमादेवीसन्निधौ सन्निवेशं। चक्रुर्लौलां लेदरीवामपारं चक्रेशाया मार्गपा आहवाय। If Cakrādhāra is identical with Cakradhara, then we find that the Kashmiri leaders coming from Cakrādhāra or Cakradhara encamped near Bhimādevī after crossing the Ledarī, for a battle; but there is no mention of any places like this in Nizām-ud-dīn or Firishtah. In the text-edition مار ناوله is apparently a misprint for مار براه.

to engage the Mughals in battle, went forward from there by way of Mārbāwah. The Sultānzāda Iskandar Khān and Mirzā Ḥaidar also came forward with an immense army to meet them. <sup>1</sup> There was a great battle, and Malik 'Alī and Mir Ḥusain and Shaikh Mir 'Alī and Mir Kamāl among the Kashmīrī commanders were slain. Of the Kāshgharīs also, some good men met their death. The Kashmīrīs wanted to turn their backs on the battle-field; but Malik Kājī and Abdāl Mākri placed their feet of bravery firmly, and, persuading and encouraging the others, did justice to their bravery and gallantry. So many men were slain on the two sides that they were beyond all calculation. Some headless bodies rose up and moved about. The reason of this has been mentioned on a former occasion. The battle between the parties went on from morning till evening. When night came on, the two armies taking note of their plunder, went back to their respective places. Both sides coming out of the battle agreed to a settlement. The Kāshghar men sent <sup>2</sup> camelot, the warm woollen cloth (purpet), and other beautiful things to Sultān

---

<sup>1</sup> The account of the battle as given by Firishtah agrees with that in the text, except that Mir Ḥusain is called Mir Ḥasan. He is also called Mir Ḥasan in one of the MSS. of the Ṭabaqāt, but he is called Mir Ḥusain in the other MS. and in the lith. ed. Col. Briggs and Rodgers generally agree, but the statement made by Rodgers (*J.A.S.B.*, vol. LIV, p. 115) that, "the prisoners were numbered on both sides, and were liberated" does not appear to me to be correct. The Cambridge History of India, page 287, only mentions the battle briefly, but the statement made in it, that "the army of Kashmīr fought so fiercely from morning until evening, that the invaders were fain to make peace", is also not correct. The advantage, if any, lay on the side of the invaders, as the Kashmīrīs at one time, were about to retire; and in any case both sides were anxious for peace. The battle is described by Prājyabhaṭṭa, in lines 331 to 337; and here we have not only the headless bodies mentioned by Niẓām-ud-dīn and Firishtah, but कवचनर्तका यक्षनरा वेतालराक्षसाः। महामांसाशनव्याः। i.e., the dancing headless bodies, *Yakshanaras*, *Vetālas* and *Rākṣasas* eager to feed on human flesh.

<sup>2</sup> The presents according to the MS. were صوف و سقرات و سایر نفاس; the lith. ed. has سقرات instead of سقرات. سقرات according to the dictionary is a purpet. Firishtah agrees with the MSS. but changes سایر to دیگر. Col. Briggs does not mention the presents; but Rodgers (*J.A.S.B.*, vol. LIV, p. 115) has "wool, hawks and precious things". Neither the Cambridge History of India nor Prājyabhaṭṭa's *Rājatarāṅgiṇī* mentions the presents.



Muḥammad and <sup>1</sup> agreed to a relationship. Sultān Muḥammad also in concert with Malik Kūjī and Abḍāl wrote a treaty of peace; and sent it with the wonderful products of Kashmīr to the Kūshghar people. <sup>2</sup> It was also settled that Sultān Muḥammad's daughter should be given in marriage to the Sultānzāda Sikandar; and the Kashmīrī prisoners still in the custody of the Mughals should be released. The Kūshgharīs agreed to this treaty, and turned towards Kūshghar; and the disturbances which had been caused in Kashmīr became changed to peace and prosperity.

During this <sup>3</sup> year two comets or stars with tails rose above the horizon. A terrible famine took place in these days, so that most of

<sup>1</sup> For an explanation of this see the *Tarikh-i-Rushidi*, p. 441, where it appears that, "everyone, according to his rank, formed a connection (*mulūkāt*) with one of the Sultāns or Maliks of Kashmīr." Mīrzā Haidar became connected with Muhammad Shāh, and according to "the Moghul practice we called each other 'friends'." Similar relations were formed between the other Moghul leaders and the Kashmīr nobles.

<sup>2</sup> Rodgers (*J.A.S.B.*, vol. LIV, p. 115) gives what appears to me to be a quite incorrect account of these terms. He says, "the Kūshghar party taking with them presents of wool, hawks and precious things, went to Muhammad Shāh, and asked his daughter in marriage to Sikandar Kūhān, and desired that the women whom the Mughals had in their hands, should there remain". Neither Nizām-ud-dīn nor Firishtah says that the Kūshghar people went to their presence, and asked for Muḥammad Shāh's daughter. They both say that it was settled that the marriage would take place. Prājyabhaṭṭa in line 342 makes a curious statement about the marriage of the princess, स्वदेशं सुगुह्यययुः। बलात् पौरत्रियं सान्नादाय राजसुतामपि। This would mean that the princess was taken away by conciliatory methods.

<sup>3</sup> The comets and famine are mentioned by Firishtah and Col. Briggs. The Cambridge History of India, page 288, mentions the famine but not the comets. Rodgers (*J.A.S.B.*, vol. LIV, p. 116) mentions two comets and the famine; and with reference to the latter, he makes the curious statement, "The massacre of Zuljir was regarded no less severe than this famine in its effect," which is very different from what Nizām-ud-dīn and Firishtah say about the matter, as would appear on a comparison of my translation. He had also apparently forgotten that he had called *Zuljir Zuljū* on page 99 of his paper. According to Prājyabhaṭṭa (l. 344) there were not two comets, but there was a rain of meteorites everywhere on the ripe paddy fields, and then a comet made its appearance. The line is पक्ष्वाक्षिवरस्कानिपूर्वचेत्रेषु सर्वतः। नभसस्वारकाः

the people died of hunger; and the remainder who survived, abandoned their native land and went away to distant places; and the story of Diljū, who had perpetrated a general massacre, having sunk into oblivion in people's minds, appeared as of no importance in comparison to this catastrophe. These hardships continued for ten months, and then ceased; and as the fruit season also drew near, some happiness made its appearance among the people.

During this period a disagreement occurred between Malik Kājī and Abdāl Mākri; and the <sup>1</sup> former coming out of the city took up his residence in Zainpūr. Malik Abdāl continued to be the Sultān's *razār*; and the governors and the officers perpetrated every kind of oppression that they wanted on the *ra'iyats*; and no one was there to attend to their complaints. <sup>2</sup> After some time, Sultān Muḥammad Shāh suffered from a burning fever; he gave away all the gold that he had to the poor and needy, and passed away from the world as a result of the same illness. The period of his reign was <sup>3</sup> fifty years.

पेतुर्भूयः केतुरदृश्यत । The famine is described in lines 345-358. It is said (l. 350) that अन्धालमन्त्रेकादयः पुण्यरता हि ते । प्रत्यहं तण्डुलशतैः पक्वान्निः पुपुषुर्जनं ॥

<sup>1</sup> Compare line 360 of Prājyabhaṭṭa. The place where Qāḍī Chak took up his residence is called Jainapura in this line. Zainapūr is mentioned in the Index of Stein's *Rājatarāṅgiṇī*, but the page reference, vol. II, page 472, against it is incorrect; on page 471, however, it is stated that "From the small town of *Jainapuri* founded by him, the new subdivision took the name of Zainapūr or Jainapura."

<sup>2</sup> The illness and death of Muḥammad Shāh and his adjurations to his ministers are described in Prājyabhaṭṭa's *Rājatarāṅgiṇī*, lines 365-373. He seems to have suffered from various complaints and not from the *تب معرق* alone mentioned by Nizām-ud-dīn and Firishtah; as it is said महादेशो देही दुष्टैरिधामयैः । खखावासात्रयैरतैः पौडया जर्जरौहतः ।

<sup>3</sup> Firishtah also says he reigned for fifty years; and Rodgers (*J.A.S.B.*, vol. LIV, p. 116) explains this by saying that, "The fifty years must reckon from 891 A.H. and include all the reigns of Fath Shāh and Nāzuk Shāh." It is noteworthy, however, that Prājyabhaṭṭa (l. 373) says that he reigned for five years वर्षान् पञ्च हन्ती भूयो राज्यं हत्वा. His last or fourth reign extended from 935 to 941 A.H., 1529-1534/35 A.D., which is about 5 years, so that the fifty of Nizām-ud-dīn and Firishtah may be a mistake for five.

<sup>1</sup> AN ACCOUNT OF SULTĀN SHAMS-UD-DĪN, SON OF SULTĀN  
MUHAMMAD SHĀH.

<sup>1</sup> Both MSS. and the Lib. ed. omit the word *of the son* after Shams-ud-din. Finishtah Lib. ed. has it. I have inserted it.

<sup>2</sup> Finishtah agrees, but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 493) following the *Tower of History* calls the successor of Muhammad Shāh Ibrahim, and not Shams-ud-din. Rodgers and the *Cambridge History of India* follow Niyām-ud-din and Finishtah. Prājyabhaṭṭa devotes some lines (374-375) to the people's lamentation on the death of Sultān Muhammad, and calls the new Sultān ਸ਼ਹੀਦ (L 380) a very abbreviated form of Shams-ud-din Shāh. It also mentions the rejoicings of the high and the low (ਜਹਾਨੀ ਵਜਹੀ ਵਜੋਂ) and their blessings in line 382. Then we suddenly come to the disputes between the two factions, but it is difficult to discover any reason for them. The two armies were stationed at ਗੰਗੋਤਰ and ਕਹਰਮਨੀਕ, and then Rigasakra went as an intermediary and concluded a settlement to the effect that Kācosakra (Qāḍi Chak) should remain at the capital and the Māṅspas (Māḍās) in Kamraj (L 389).

<sup>3</sup> باعتدال تام in the text-edition is apparently a misprint for باعتدال تام.

<sup>4</sup> As to the account of the latter part of the reign of Shams-ud-din and the reign of Nāruk Shāh, Finishtah agrees almost word for word, and so does Rodgers. The *Cambridge History of India*, page 288, says that Shams-ud-din II died in June or July 1540, when Nāruk Shāh was restored. The account in Prājyabhaṭṭa's *Rājataranginī* is very confused. It mentions the intrigues of the leaders and the incursions of the Mughals (L 403) but I have not been able to discover anything about Shams-ud-din or Nāruk Shāh.

cannot be ascertained. After him his son Nāzuk Shāh sat on the seat of government; but five or six months had not passed, when Mirzā Ḥaidar having acquired power in the country took possession of it. During the period of his rule, public prayers were read and coins struck in the renowned name of His Majesty, Jinnat Ashiānī  
<sup>1</sup> Humāyūn *Bādshāh*.

#### AN ACCOUNT OF THE RULE OF MIRZĀ ḤAIDAR.

In the year 948 A.H., at the time, when Jinnat Ashiānī having been defeated by Shēr Khān had come to Lāhōre, Abdāl Mākri and <sup>2</sup> Rēgī Chak and some other of the chief men of the Kashmīr sent a petition, through Mirzā Ḥaidar, containing expressions of their loyalty, and incitements to him to seize the country. His Majesty (*i.e.*, Humāyūn) gave Mirzā Ḥaidar permission to go; and also decided to follow him himself. When Mirzā Ḥaidar arrived at <sup>3</sup> Bhimbar,

<sup>1</sup> One MS. omits by mistake the passage from *جنت اشيانى* محمد همايون *بادشاه* *بريد*, including the heading about the rule of Mirzā Ḥaidar.

<sup>2</sup> He is called Zangī Chak in the lith. ed. of *Firishtah*, Zungy Chuk by Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 498), and Zangī Chakk by Rodgers (*J.A.S.B.*, vol. LIV, p. 117) and the Cambridge History of India; and the translators of the *Tarikh-i-Rashidi* also call him Zangi Chak; but the name is *رنگی چک* in both MSS. of the *Ṭabaqāt*, and more distinctly *رنگی چک* in the lith. ed. Of course there is very little difference between *رنگی* and *زنگی* as written in Persian. *रिगचक्र* or *रिगचक्रेश* is mentioned by Prājyabhaṭṭa in lines 388, 393 and elsewhere. *Rīga Cakra* may be transformed to Rēgī Chak, but cannot be changed to Zangī Chak. Rēgī Chak is, therefore, the correct name and I have kept it. *رنگی چک* in the text-edition is incorrect.

<sup>3</sup> The name looks like *بہر* in the MS. The lith. ed. has *بہر* and *Firishtah* lith. ed. has *بہر* Bhīr. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 498) has Mein, and Rodgers (*J.A.S.B.*, vol. LIV, p. 117) has Bhīr. The Cambridge History of India does not mention the name of the place. I consulted the fountain head for the correct name, but Mirza Haidar is delightfully vague in the *Tarikh-i-Rashidi*, page 483, where he says, "when I arrived at the foot of the pass (leading to) Kashmir, Kāchi Chak ascended (?) by one road and we by another, and without further contention or discussion, we (all) arrived at (Kashmir)." I cannot find any place of the name of Bhīr, but Bhimbar or "Bhimbar" lies at the foot of the outer hills, in the centre of the tract between the Vitastā and the Cinab, note 180, page 33, Stein's *Rājataranginī*. So I think Bhimbar is correct, and I have kept it. In the text-edition M. Hidayat Ḥosain has *بہر*.

Abdāl Mākri and Rēgī Chak came and joined him. There were not more than four hundred horsemen with Mirzā Ḥaidar. When he arrived at Rājaurī, Kāji Chak, who was (then the *de facto*) ruler of Kashmīr, came with three thousand horsemen and fifty thousand foot soldiers to the <sup>1</sup> Karmal pass, and strengthened it. Mirzā Ḥaidar abandoned that route, and started by way of Punj. Kāji Chak in his great pride did not guard that road; and Mirzā Ḥaidar, crossing the hill, arrived in the Kashmīr plateau; and suddenly took possession of the city of Srīnagar. Abdāl Mākri and Rēgī Chak having secured a footing, took charge of all affairs; and allotted some *parganas* as the Mirzā's *jāgīr*. It so happened that about this time Abdāl Mākri's days came to an end; and he died after recommending his sons to the Mirzā.

After the arrival of Mirzā Ḥaidar in Kashmīr, <sup>2</sup> Kaji Chak went to Shēr Khān Afghan in Hindūstān; and brought five thousand horsemen, who were commanded by Ḥusain Sharwānī and <sup>3</sup> 'Ādil Khān

<sup>1</sup> Firishtah has کتل کرتل and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 498) has Kurmul pass. In the text-edition کرتل has been changed to کیرتل. Rodgers (*J.A.S.B.*, vol. LIV) p. 117, has transformed Katal Kartal to "Khabal Kartal (it is called Karmal by Erskine)"; and he has transformed پنج, which is written as پنج in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. of the Ṭabaqāt and as پنج in Firishtah lith. ed., out of all recognition to "Pabhaj (the Pamīj of Erskine)." Col. Briggs comes very near the correct name and calls it Punnuj. The Cambridge History of India, page 288, does not give the name of the place, where Kāji Chakk was stationed; but gives the correct name (Pūnch) of the pass, by which Mirzā Ḥaidar crossed the hill. It makes the statement that Mirza Ḥaidar's allies "engaged Kāji Chakk's attention by threatening a frontal attack"; but I cannot find any authority whatever for it. Both the Ṭabaqāt and Firishtah simply say that he abandoned that route, and Mirza Ḥaidar (whose words I have quoted in the preceding note) whatever he says or means, does not mention any threat of a frontal attack by his allies on Kāchi Chak.

<sup>2</sup> According to Mirza Ḥaidar (*Tarikh-i-Rashidi*, p. 485), there was an interval of some months between his arrival, and Kūchi Chak's bringing the troops from Shir Khūn. Mirza Ḥaidar crossed the pass into Kashmīr on the 22nd of Rajab. Then the winter came on, and it was not till the beginning of spring that Shir Khan's troops arrived. Just then Abdāl Mākri was attacked by paralysis and died.

<sup>3</sup> The name is 'Alāwal Khān in one MS. and in the lith. ed.; but it is 'Ādil Khān in the other MS. and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah.

and two elephants, to reinforce his own troops. Mirzā Ḥaidar in concert with Rēgī Chak, advanced to meet him in battle. The two parties arrayed their forces between the villages of <sup>1</sup>Datarbār and Kāwāh; and the breeze of victory having blown on the plumes of the standards of Mirzā Ḥaidar, the *amīrs* of Shēr Khān and Kāji Chak were routed. Kāji Chak took up his residence in <sup>2</sup>Bahramgalah. Mullā Muḥammad Yūsuf the *Khaṭīb* (preacher) of the *Jama'* Mosque of Srinagar <sup>3</sup>obtained the date of the victory in the words "*Fath-i-Mukarrar*".

In the year 950 A.H., Mirzā Ḥaidar took up his residence in the fort of <sup>4</sup>Indarkōt. <sup>5</sup>Owing to Mirzā Ḥaidar having entertained suspicions about Rēgī Chak, the latter fled and went to Kāji Chak; and the two united together, and in the year 951 A.H., advanced towards Srinagar with the object of destroying Mirzā Ḥaidar's power). Bahrām Chak son of Rēgī Chak reached Srinagar. Mirzā Ḥaidar nominated Bandagān Kōkah and Khwājah Ḥājī Kashmīrī to crush

<sup>1</sup> The names are دتر بارو and کاؤ in one MS. and in the lith. ed., and کاؤ and و نه دیار in the other MS. Firishtah lith. ed. has کاؤ and و نه دیار. The *Tarikh-i-Rashidi* gives various particulars which are not to be found in the *Tabaqūt* or in Firishtah, but does not give the names of these villages. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 499) has Dhumuj and Gava, and Rodgers (*J.A.S.B.*, vol. LIV, p. 117) has Danahdyār and Kāwah. The Cambridge History of India does not give any name. In the text-edition the names are موضح کاؤ and دتر بارو.

<sup>2</sup> Bahramgalah has wrongly been changed to کله پرم Parmkalah in the text-edition.

<sup>3</sup> The meaning is not clear, some words having probably been omitted. I have, however, supplied the omission by a reference to page 485 of the *Tarikh-i-Rashidi*.

<sup>4</sup> According to the *Tarikh-i-Rashidi*, page 485, Mirza Haidar is said to have placed his and his followers' families in the fort of Andarkul, when he was going to fight Kāchi Chak and Shir Khān's armies. The translators say in a note that this must be the Indrakot of Firishtah. Firishtah, however would not dream of writing Indrakot, he has Indarkot. It may be noted, however, that there is a *pargana* called Andarkōth among those of the Kamrāj tract (Stein, vol. II, p. 491). So Indarkōt may be correct.

<sup>5</sup> Firishtah agrees, but Col. Briggs makes various mistakes. Rodgers's account follows Firishtah. The Cambridge History of India, page 288, apparently follows Col. Briggs about Zangī (Rēgī) Chakk's becoming suspicious of Haidar's attitude, instead of Haidar becoming suspicious of him.

him, and he was unable to meet them, and fled. When the Mirzā's troops pursued him, Kāji Chak and Rēgi Chak, considering flight the safest course, took up their quarters at Bahramgalah. Mirzā Ḥaidar left Bandagān Kōkah and others at Srinagar and advanced to conquer Tibet; and seized the fort of <sup>1</sup> Kōsūr, among the great forts, and some other forts.

In the year 952 A.H., Kāji Chak and his son Muḥammad Chak died of a <sup>2</sup> shivering fever. Mirzā Ḥaidar passed the year in peace. In the year 953 A.H., Rēgi Chak fought with the *amīrs* of Mirzā Ḥaidar, and was killed; and his head with that of his son Ghāzi Khān was brought before Mirzā Ḥaidar.

In the year 954 A.H., an ambassador arrived from Kāshghar. Mirzā Ḥaidar went to Lār to welcome him. Ūjh Bahrām, son of Mas'ūd Chak, who for seven years had fought bravely in Kamrāj and had defeated everyone there, made proposals of peace to Khān Mirak Mirzā, and made conditions and engagements. Khān Mirak Mirzā summoned him after making promises and taking oaths. But when Ūjh Bahrām came to his *majlis*, he drew a dagger out of his boot, and stabbed him in the stomach. The man, wounded as he was, fled and got into the jungle. Khān Mirak Mirzā hastened in pursuit of him, and seizing him cut off his head, and brought it to Mirzā Ḥaidar at Lār, believing that Mirzā Ḥaidar would be pleased. <sup>3</sup> 'Idi Zinā, after the food had been brought in, rose up in great

<sup>1</sup> The name of the fort is کوسور and الوسوا in the MS., and کوسوار in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has لوسور; Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 499) has Looshoo, and Rodgers (*J.A.S.B.*, vol. LIV, p. 117) has Lansūr. The *Tarikh-i-Rashidi* is of no help, as it ends with Mirza Haidar's victory.

<sup>2</sup> تپ لرزہ instead of تپ لرزہ in the text-edition.

<sup>3</sup> It is not clear who he was. He was apparently someone in authority, for Mirzā Ḥaidar thought it necessary to excuse himself on the ground of his ignorance of Mirak Mirzā's acts (Jān Mirak Mirzā in the text-edition). He is, however, named, a few lines below, as one of the leaders of the vanguard of the army sent to conquer Kishtwār. Both the MSS. say بعد از حاضر ساختن طعام. The lith. ed. omits the word طعام. Firishtah says nothing about anything being brought. If the reading in the MSS. is correct, the production of the head was delayed till the food was brought in, apparently with the object of giving it a special relish. In the text-edition the name is عیدی زینا 'Idi Rainā, but Rodgers (*J.A.S.B.*, vol. LIV, p. 118) has Ide Zinā.

anger and wrath on seeing the head; and said "It is not right to kill a person after making conditions and engagements." Mīrzā Ḥaidar said, "I had no information of these happenings."

After this, Mīrzā Ḥaidar advanced from Lār to Kishtwār. He made <sup>1</sup> Bandagān Kōkah, Muḥammad Mākri, Makna Mughal, Mīrzā Muḥammad Yaḥiya and 'Īdī Zinā the commanders of his vanguard; and himself remained in the village of <sup>2</sup> Jhālū near (the boundary of) Kishtwār. The vanguard, after traversing marches of three days in one day, arrived in the village of <sup>3</sup> Dōhut which was on their side of the river Mārmā. The Kishtwārā army was on the opposite side of the river. There was a skirmish of arrows and musket shots, but neither party could cross the river. The following day Mīrzā Ḥaidar's army, turning from the right road, wanted to get into Kishtwār. When they arrived in the village of <sup>4</sup> Dār, a strong wind

<sup>1</sup> The names are as I have them in the text in the MSS. and the lith. ed. of the Ṭabaqāt, with slight variations. Firishtah lith. ed. omits the third and makes Mīrzā Muḥammad Yaḥiya Zinā one man. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 500) only gives the name of Bandagan Koka, and adds "with other officers." Rodgers (*J.A.S.B.*, vol. LIV, p. 118) follows Firishtah, but calls the last man there Yaḥi Zinā. The Cambridge History of India does not give any name.

<sup>2</sup> The name looks like جہالڑ and جہانڑ in the MS. and دو جہانڑ in the lith. ed. of the Ṭabaqāt. Firishtah lith. ed. has جہاپر. Col. Briggs does not mention the place, but Rodgers, following Firishtah, calls it Jhāpūr. The place is not mentioned on page 21 of the Introduction to Elias and Ross's *Tarikh-i-Rashidi* where the editors speak of the expedition against Kishtawār. In the text-edition it is جنالو.

<sup>3</sup> The name of the village looks like دوہوت and دومت in the MSS. It is دوست in the lith. ed. of the Ṭabaqāt, and دھوت in that of Firishtah. Rodgers (*J.A.S.B.*, vol. LIV, p. 118) has Dahlot. No name is given in the introduction of the *Tarikh-i-Rashidi*, but it is said that the advance guard came up with the enemy on the banks of the Kishtawār river. The name of the river is ماربا, or ماربا, or ماربا in the MS. and the lith. ed. of the Ṭabaqāt. Firishtah lith. ed. has ماربا. Col. Briggs does not give the name; and Rodgers says, "where the river winds". In the text-edition دیہوت is adopted as the name of the village.

<sup>4</sup> The name of the village is دار in one MS. and in the lith. ed., and دال in the other MS. It is Dhār in the lith. ed. of Firishtah, and Rodgers (*J.A.S.B.*, vol. LIV, p. 118).



rose, and it became dark. The Kashmīris came bravely in crowds and attacked them. Bandagān Kōkah, who was the leader of Mirzā Ḥaidar's army, was slain with many others. When they started from there, Muḥammad Mākri and his son with twenty-five principal-men were slain on the road. The rest, who had escaped death from the sword, came and after suffering much privations, joined Mirzā Ḥaidar. The Mirzā coming back from there in the year 995 A.H., advanced towards Tibet and conquering Rājauri from the Kashmīris made it over to <sup>1</sup> Muḥammad Naḡr and Ṣabr 'Alī. He gave Pakli to Mullā 'Abd-ul-lah and little Tibet to Mullā Qāsim; and conquering great Tibet appointed a person of the name of <sup>2</sup> Muḥsin to be its governor.

In the year 956 A.H., Mirzā Ḥaidar turned his attention to the fort of <sup>3</sup> Danil. Ādam Kakhar came there; and prayed for the pardon of the offences of Daulat Chak, nephew (brother's son) of Kūji Chak. Mirzā Ḥaidar granted the prayer; and sitting with Ādam in his pavilion, summoned Daulat Chak to come there. The latter <sup>4</sup> became angry, and rose up, and taking the elephant which he had brought with him as a tribute, went away. Some persons wanted to pursue him, but Mirzā Ḥaidar forbade them.

<sup>1</sup> The first name is Muḥammad Naḡr in both MSS. and the lith. ed. The second name is Ṣabr 'Alī in one MS. and **صبر علی** which may be a mistake for **ببر علی** in the other, and Mir 'Alī in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has Muḥammad Naḡir and Naṣir 'Alī. Col. Briggs does not mention the names, and Rodgers gives the names after Firishtah. No names are given in the introduction (p. 21) to the *Tarikh-i-Rashidi*, which contrary to Niẓām-ud-dīn and Firishtah's account, that he seized Rājauri, Pakli, Little Tibet and Tibet in the order mentioned, says that he conquered Little Tibet (or Baltistan), Tibet (or Ladak) and subsequently Rājauri and Pakhli.

<sup>2</sup> The name is **مکسن نام** in both MSS. and **مکسن نامی** in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has Mullā Qāsim.

<sup>3</sup> The name is **دمل** and **دملی** in the MSS., and **دپهل** in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has **دنیل**. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 501) has Deebul, and Rodgers (*J.A.S.B.*, vol. LIV, p. 118) has Danel. In the text-edition it is **دمل**.

<sup>4</sup> Firishtah surmises that **نمالباً چنانچه مرئی او بود اعزاز و اکرام بجا نیاوردند** as the probable reason for Daulat Chak's anger.

After some time, Mirzā (Ḥaidar) returned to Kashmīr. <sup>1</sup> Daulat Chak and Ghāzī Khān and Ḥasan Chak and Bahrām Chak went to Haibat Khān Niyāzī, who having been defeated by Islām Khān, had come to Rājaurī. Islām Khān had also come to <sup>2</sup> Madwār, belonging to the Naushahrāh area in pursuit of the Niyāzis. <sup>3</sup> He sent Saiyid Khān 'Abd-ul-mulk one of his trusted servants to Haibat Khān; and Saiyid Khān, having introduced matters about an amicable settlement, brought the mother and sister of Haibat Khān to Islām Khān. The latter then turned back, and coming to the village of <sup>4</sup> Ban, in the neighbourhood of Siālkōt, took up his quarters there. The Kashmīris mentioned above took Haibat Khān to <sup>5</sup> Būrāmūla, and wanted to take him to Kashmīr, in order to do away with Mirzā Ḥaidar (with his help). He, however, could not make up his mind to do so; and sending a Brahman to Mirzā Ḥaidar, made proposals for peace. Mirzā Ḥaidar sent ample funds by the hand of that Brahman; and Haibat Khān, leaving the place where he was, went to the village of <sup>6</sup> Bīr, which is a dependancy of the territory of Jammū. <sup>7</sup> The

<sup>1</sup> Firishtah substitutes Jai Chak for Ḥasan Chak, and is followed by Rodgers. Firishtah, however, has the name of Haibat Khān correctly, but Rodgers (*J.A.S.B.*, vol. LIV, p. 118) converts it to Haidar Khān, though a few lines further down, he has Haibat Khān Niyāzī.

<sup>2</sup> The name is Madwār in one MS. and Badwār in the other and in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has Madwār. The article ز appears to have been omitted before ولايت in the MSS. and the lith. ed.

<sup>3</sup> Firishtah (and following him, Col. Briggs) and Rodgers (*J.A.S.B.*, vol. LIV, p. 118) say that it was Haibat Khān who sent Sayyid Khān Niyāzī to Islām Shāh.

<sup>4</sup> The name is Ban in one MS. and in the lith. ed. It looks like Man in the other MS. Firishtah lith. ed. and Rodgers have Ban, but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 502) has Bhimbaur.

<sup>5</sup> The MSS. have وامله, and the lith. ed. has دابله, but Firishtah lith. ed. has باره موله which, I think, is correct. It is دامله in the text-edition.

<sup>6</sup> The name is بئر, and برکه in the MSS. and لبر in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has غير. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 502) has "the town of Subzeeā," while Rodgers (*J.A.S.B.*, vol. LIV, p. 119) has Hīr, and says that it is Nīr in MS. No. 6571, in the British Museum. هرکه has been adopted in the text-edition.

<sup>7</sup> Firishtah and Col. Briggs and Rodgers agree. Rodgers (*J.A.S.B.*, vol. LIV, p. 119) says that he has seen two coins of Islām Shāh of this time,

Kashmīris separated from him, went to Islām Khān, but Ghāzī Khān went to Mirzā Ḥaidar.

In the year 957 A.H., Mirzā Ḥaidar, becoming assured in his mind of the condition of the outskirts of the country, sent Khwājah Shams Mughal, with a large quantity of saffron, as an ambassador to Islām Khān; and in the year 958 A.H., Khwājah Shams returned with many presents, and much rich stuffs; and Yāsīn Afghān came from Islām Khān with Khwājah Shams; and Mirzā Ḥaidar gave (many) shawls, and much saffron to Islām Khān's ambassador, and gave him permission to return.

He then appointed Qarrā Bahādur Mirzā to the government of Baharmal; and sent 'Īdī Zīnā and Nāzuk Shāh and Ḥusain Mākri and Khwājah Ḥājī from amongst the Kashmīris with him. <sup>1</sup> Qarrā Bahādur and the Kashmīris left Indarkōt, and took up their quarters at Bārāmūla, and commenced to create disturbances on the ground that the Mughals looked down on them. The Mughals represented this to Mirzā Ḥaidar, but the latter did not believe it; and said that the Mughals were not in any way better than the Kashmīris in the matter of creating disaffection and disturbance. <sup>2</sup> Ḥusain Mākri sent his brother 'Alī Mākri to Mirzā Ḥaidar, to make him acquainted

and adds that the Kashmīris were tired of Mirzā Ḥaidar, and wanted to have Islām Shāh as their king, and the coins were struck in anticipation of his conquering the country, or they might have been struck by Mirzā Ḥaidar himself in compliment to Islām Shāh.

<sup>1</sup> Firishtah agrees, but Rodgers wrongly translates the words از اندر کوت بر آمده which are in the lith. ed. of Firishtah as well as in the Ṭabaqāt, by the words "came back to Indarkot." The sentence, as it stands, means that Qarrā Bahādur and the Kashmīris all commenced to create disturbances, but apparently it was the Kashmīris who did so. Rodgers's translation of the words که مغلان ایشانرا در نظر نمی آرند by the words that "the Mughals (the forces of Mirzā Ḥaidar) were not acceptable to them" also appears to be incorrect.

<sup>2</sup> Apparently Ḥusain and 'Alī were not acting in concert with the other Kashmīris. There are slight differences in the wording of the sentences. I have adopted the reading quoted by one of the two MSS., which makes most sense, but I have had to change the last word طلبید which is in both MSS. to طلبد. Firishtah lith. ed. has طلبد. Rodgers's translation (*J.A.S.B.*, vol. LIV, p. 119) in which he reads the word عذر as عذر (excuse) appears to me to be incorrect.

with the treachery of the Kashmīris, so that he might decide to recall the army. Mirzā Ḥaidar took no notice and refused to listen to him; and said "What cause of jealousy should the Kashmīris have against you that they should act treacherously towards you," and did not summon the army back.

On the 27th of the Ramaḍān there was a great conflagration in the Indarkōt; and most of the houses were burnt down. Qarrā Bahādur and all the men sent the following message, "Our houses have been burnt down; if you will give an order we would come and repair our houses and turn our attention next year to Baharmal." Mirzā Ḥaidar did not at all agree to this; and the army had to proceed to Baharmal, whether they liked it or not.

‘Īdī Zīnū and all the Kashmīris then combined together; and when night came they separated themselves from the Mughals, and came to the pass of Baharmal. They also separated Ḥusain Mākri and ‘Alī Mākri from the Mughals, and took them with themselves, so that they might not be slain with the Mughals. In the morning, there was a battle between the Mughals and the men of Baharmal, and the former were entangled and confined in the hills. Saiyid Mirzā, however, fled to <sup>1</sup> Dabil. About fifty renowned Mughals were slain, and Muḥammad Naẓr and Qarrā Bahādur were taken prisoners. The rest, who escaped the sword, came by way of Punch to Bahramgalah. Mirzā Ḥaidar was deeply grieved on hearing this news and ordered that the broken silver <sup>2</sup> *dēgs* (sauce-pans), which are now current in Kashmīr, be coined. He also made Jahāngīr Mākri his trusted agent, and bestowed the *jāgīr* of Ḥusain Mākri on him. He also gave horses and money to many of the craftsmen, and made soldiers of them. Just after this news came that Mullā ‘Abd-ul-lah on hearing of the rising of the Kashmīris

<sup>1</sup> The name looks like دعل and دبل in the MSS. and رمل in the lith ed. and appears therefore to be identical with Danil, see page 712 and note 3. Firishtah lith. ed. however has قلعه بهرمل. دعلی in the text-edition is certainly incorrect.

<sup>2</sup> There is a word which looks like سہمی or سہمی Sahī, in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. which I cannot make out, but which may be "made of copper". Firishtah lith. ed. has زیرکمه in the corresponding passage. سہمی has been adopted in the text-edition.

was coming to meet Mirzā Ḥaidar; but when he arrived near Bārāmūla the rebels who had collected in large numbers slow him; and Khwājah Qāsim was slain in little Tibet; and Muḥammad Naẓr was taken prisoner in Rājauri; and the Kashmīrīs having collected in large numbers had come from Bahramgalah to <sup>1</sup> Hirahpūr. Mirzā Ḥaidar, having no other alternative, <sup>2</sup> came out of Indarkōt, with the intention of engaging them. The total number of men with him was only a thousand. Among the Mughals men like ‘Abd-ur-raḥman and Shāhẓāda Lang, and <sup>3</sup> Khān Mirak Mirzā and Mīr Makta and <sup>4</sup> Ṣabr ‘Alī and others, who were altogether about seven hundred men, joined him; and they took up their quarters at Shihāb-ud-dīnpūr.

Daulat Chak and Ghāzī Khān and other notable leaders in concert with ‘Idī Zinā collected their men, and came to Hirāpūr, and leaving that place came to the village of Khānpūr. Mirzā Ḥaidar encamped in the plain of Khālidgarh, which is close to Srinagar. Fath Chak, whose father had been slain by the Mughals, raided Indarkōt with Rāja Bahrām and three thousand men, in order to avenge his father's death, and burnt down the buildings erected by Mirzā Ḥaidar in the *Bāgh-i-Ṣafā*. When Mirzā Ḥaidar heard this news, he said, "I did not bring these edifices from Kāshghar. With Divine favour similar ones can be built." Ṣabr ‘Alī burnt down the edifices of Sulṭān Zain-ul-‘ābidīn, which were in Suyyapūr, in retaliation of the burning down of Mirzā Ḥaidar's buildings, but the Mirzā was not pleased at this. (They) also burnt down the houses of ‘Idī Zinā and Naurūz

---

<sup>1</sup> The name is clearly Hirahpūr in the MSS. as well as in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has what looks like Habzāpūr. Col. Briggs's account (vol. IV, pp. 502, 503) is very sketchy, the whole of the incident from the appointment of Qarrā Bahādur (called Kiran Bahadur) to Baharmal (called Bheerbul) to the death of Mirza Heidur being narrated in the space of eight or nine lines; and the name of the place under consideration is not mentioned. Rodgers (*J.A.S.B.*, vol. LIV, p. 120) calls the place Hambarapūr.

<sup>2</sup> Rodgers translates بر امدہ کوٹ as "came to Indarkot."

<sup>3</sup> خان میرک میرزا in the text-edition is a misprint for خان پرک میرزا.

<sup>4</sup> The name is میر علی in one MS. and the lith. ed., and حر علی in the other MS. Firishtah lith. ed. has جر علی, but Rodgers has Jai Ali. In the text-edition میر مکنہ is a misprint for میر مکتہ.

Chak in Srinagar. After this Mīrzā Ḥaidar came and took up his residence in Khānpūr. In this village there is a <sup>1</sup> plane tree, in the shade of which two hundred horsemen can stand; and it has been found by trial, that whenever a single branch of it is moved the whole tree shakes. The writer of this history Nizām-ud-dīn Aḥmad was in attendance, when the sublime standards of His Majesty the Khālifā-i-Hāhī went on a visit to Kashmīr for the second time; and he saw the tree, and examined it. In short, the Kashmīris moved from Khānpūr and came to the village of <sup>2</sup> Adanpūr; and the distance (between the two armies) was not more than <sup>3</sup> two *karōhs*.

Mīrzā Ḥaidar then decided that he should make a night attack on the enemy; and he gave direction that Mīrzā ‘Abd-ur-raḥman, his brother, who was adorned with the attributes of piety and purity, should become his heir; and took the allegiance of his men to him. Then they all mounted, and started for making the attack. As decreed by fate, there were heavy clouds that night. When they arrived near the tent of Khwājah Hājī, who was the cause of the disturbance, and also the *rakīl* (agent or representative) of the Mīrzā, nothing could be seen owing to the darkness. Shāh Naẓr a cuirassier says, “At this time I shot an arrow. The voice of Mīrzā Ḥaidar came to my ears, which said ‘thou hast done an evil thing.’ I knew that my arrow had hit the Mīrzā.” It is also narrated that a

<sup>1</sup> The name is *بید* in one MS., and *چنار بید* in the other. The lith. ed. has *خبازی چنار* and *خبازی* may be mistakes for *چنار* (Chinār or the plane tree, while *بید* is a willow. Frishtah lith. ed. has *بید* and Rodgers has willow. Both plane trees and willows grow in Kashmīr, but I should be inclined to think that the tree in question was a plane tree which is a tall spreading tree.

<sup>2</sup> Both MSS. have *ادن پور*. The lith. ed. has *ادب پور*. Frishtah lith. ed. has *ادنی پور* and Rodgers (*J.A.S.B.*, vol. LIV, p. 120) has Adnīpūr.

<sup>3</sup> It should be noted, however, that just before this, apparently the two armies were both in Khānpūr.

<sup>4</sup> The readings in the MSS. are *قباحت بولدی* and *قباحت تولدی* and in the lith. ed. *صاحب تولدی*. These are all incorrect, unless *بولدی* or *تولدی* is same word in the dialect of Kāshghar. Frishtah lith. ed. has *قباحت کردی* which I have adopted. The whole affair is mysterious. Although it was dark the cause of the death could have been ascertained. Then, why was the corpse, or in fact the man, who was on the point of death left lying where he had fallen.

butcher hit his thigh with an arrow. Another tradition is that <sup>1</sup>Kamāl Kōkah slew him with the sword; but there was nothing (visible) on his body except a wound caused by an <sup>2</sup>arrow. In short, when the morning came, it was bruited about, that a Mughal, who had been killed, was lying there. When Khwājah Hājī and his son arrived at the spot, they saw that it was Mirzā Haidar. They raised his head from the ground. There was no more than breath left. The dying man opened his eyes, and surrendered his life to the creator. The Mughals fled to Indarkōt. The Kashmiris going in pursuit of them <sup>3</sup> took up the corpse of Mirzā Haidar to the Darbadū Mausoleum, and buried it.

The people were sorely grieved at the death of Mirzā Haidar. The Mughals got into Indarkōt, and fortified themselves in it; and fight went on for three days. On the 4th day Muḥammad Rūmī <sup>4</sup> shot Kashmiri coins from mortars, and every one, who was hit, was killed. At last, <sup>5</sup>Khānam, the widow of Mirzā Haidar, and his sister said to the Mughals, "As Mirzā Haidar has gone away from us, it is better to have peace with the Kashmiris." The Mughals accepted this, and sent Amīr Khān, the architect, to the Kashmiris to conclude a pact. The Kashmiris agreeing to a peaceful settlement gave a letter containing engagements and oaths to the effect that they would not cause any trouble to the Mughals.

The period of Mirzā Haidar's rule was ten years.

<sup>1</sup> The name is کمال دوتہ in the MSS. and کمال دوی in the lith. ed. I cannot find any meaning of دوتہ or دوی. Firishtah lith. ed. has Kamāl Kakah and I have adopted it. The reading in the MSS. is followed in the text-edition.

<sup>2</sup> One MS. has زخم تیر و تبر و خنجر دیگر, which is of course incorrect. The other has زخم تیر چیز دیگر, which appears to be correct. The lith. ed. is also incorrect; it has زخم تیر و تبر چیز دیگر. Firishtah lith. ed. has the same reading as the second MS., and this is followed in the text-edition.

<sup>3</sup> It is curious that the Mughals did not even attempt to carry away the Mirzā's dead body; and it was left to the Kashmiris to bury it. The MSS. as well as the lith. ed. say that they buried the body in در بدو مزار. I cannot find out what this burial place was. Firishtah only says that the Kashmiris seeing the body of the Mirzā buried it.

<sup>4</sup> There are slight differences in the readings.

<sup>5</sup> She is so called in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. calls her خانمی and it calls the Mirzā's sister خانجی.

## AN ACCOUNT OF NĀZUK SHĀH.

When the gates of the fort (of Indarkōt) were opened, the Kashmiris entered the <sup>1</sup>apartment containing valuable furnitures, etc. belonging to Mirzā Ḥaidar and carried away fine and delicate goods. They brought the family and dependants of Mirzā Ḥaidar to Srinagar, and placed them <sup>2</sup>in the house of Ḥasan Matū. They divided the country of Kashmīr among themselves; and *pargana* <sup>3</sup>Dēvsar was allotted to Daulat Chak, and that of <sup>4</sup>Wahī to Ghāzī Khān and that of <sup>5</sup>Kamrāj to Yūsuf Chak and Bahrām Chak. One *lakh* of <sup>6</sup>donkey-loads of paddy (or rice in husks) was allotted to Khwājah Ḥājī, the *rakīl*, of Mirzā Ḥaidar. Daulat Chak gave *pargana* Dēvsar, which was his *jāgīr* to his son Ḥabīb Chak, and the daughter of 'Idī Zīnā was married to the latter. The *amīrs* of Kashmīr, and more specially 'Idī Zīnā, having gained complete power, raised Nāzuk Shāh on the throne, and kept him as a puppet; but in fact 'Idī Zīnā was the *Bīdshāh*.

<sup>1</sup> The word is خاںشک, which according to the dictionary is a wardrobe, and which Rodgers call the treasury. It is really what I have called it in the text. There is or at least was some years ago, what was called a *Toshākhānā* correctly *Tūshakkhānā* of the government of India, in which the articles offered to the Viceroy at the Durbars were kept.

<sup>2</sup> I have not thought it necessary to point out all the mistakes in Rodgers's paper, but I cannot pass the over. The words both in the *Ṭabaqāt* and in *Firishtah* are اهل و عيال ميرزا را در سرى نگراوردند و در حوبلى حسنى معوز جا دادند but معوز of the *Ṭabaqāt* is معز in *Firishtah*. My translation is based on this text. Rodgers (*J.A.S.B.*, vol. LIV, p. 121) has, "the family of the Mirzā was taken to Srinagar, and placed in the hands of Manūjā."

<sup>3</sup> Given as one of the S.E. *parganahs*, see list on page 369 of the *Āin-i-Albarī* (Jarratt, vol. II).

<sup>4</sup> It is written as رهمى in both MSS. and the lith. ed. *Firishtah* lith. ed. has رهمى, and I have taken this in preference to رهمى, as it is probably identical with Vihī, one of the *parganahs* east of Śrinagar (*Āin-i-Albarī*, Jarratt, vol. II, p. 368).

<sup>5</sup> Kamrāj is called a tract containing 16 *Mahals*, page 370 of the *Āin-i-Albarī* (Jarratt, vol. II) but there is a *parganah* also of the name of Kamrāj included in the S.W. *parganahs* of the Kamrāj tract.

<sup>6</sup> يك لک خروار شالى i.e., a *lakh* of donkey-loads of paddy is transformed into "a *lakh* of shawls" by Rodgers (*J.A.S.B.*, vol. LIV, p. 121).



In the year 959 A.H. Sankar Chak, son of Kājī Chak, wanted to go away from Kashmīr (i.e., I suppose Srinagar), as Ghāzī Khān who called himself the son of Kājī Chak and had much *jāgīr*. The details of this statement are these: that Sankar Chak was the son of Kājī Chak without any difficulty or doubt, and Ghāzī Khān although he was commonly known to be the son of Kājī Chak was not in reality his son; for Kājī Chak, after the death of his brother Hasan Chak, took the latter's widow, who was then with child (who was afterwards named Ghāzī Khān); and after two or three months the child was born. Hence Sankar Chak on account of the envy (which he bore) to Ghāzī Khān wanted to leave Kashmīr and go to <sup>1</sup> 'Īdī Zinā. When a rumour of this got about, Daulat Chak and Ghāzī Khān sent <sup>2</sup> Isma'il Hāyat and Harjū, with one hundred men to summon Sankar Chak. They told them that if he did not come with them they were to bring him by force. Sankar Chak did not come on their summons, and went to 'Īdī Zinā. In the end 'Īdī Zinā came to them, and made an amicable settlement; and the *parganas* of <sup>3</sup> Kothār and Khāwar and Māwar having been allotted to Sankar Chak the disturbance subsided.

At this time, there were four groups who had power in Kashmīr (1) 'Īdī Zinā with his group; (2) Hasan Mākri, son of Abdāl Mākri

<sup>1</sup> It is not at all clear where he was.

<sup>2</sup> The name is written as اسمعیل زینت in one MS. and in the lith. ed. In the other MS. the last half of the name is written as هانت without any dots above or below the second or third letters. This second part is distinctly written as هانت in Firishṭah lith. ed., and Rodgers has Hanit. اسمعیل هانت has been adopted in the text-edition.

<sup>3</sup> The names of the *parganas* are not very easily decipherable. They look like کونہار و کاندرو و عاور in one MS. In the other they are the same except that the first is کونہار. In the lith. ed. there is apparently only one name کونہار و بارو. Firishṭah lith. ed. has کونہار و کاندرو و عاور and Rodgers (*J.A.S.B.*, vol. LIV. p. 122) has Kothār Khāwān and Madurū. In the list of *parganas* in the *Āin-i-Akbarī* (Jarratt, vol. II. p. 369) there are two *parganas* Khayṭār and Khāwarpūrah, and I think it very probable that Sankar Chak got these. In the tabulated list of Kashmīr *Parganas* in Stein's *Rājataranginī* (vol. II. pp. 493. 494) I find Kuṭahār, but no trace of any of the other. In the text-edition the names are کونہار و کاندرو و عاور.

with his group; (3) the <sup>1</sup> Kishtwāris whose leaders were Bahrām Chak and Yūsuf Chak and others; and (4) the Kāmīs of whom Kājī Chak, Daulat Chak and Ghāzī Khān were the leaders. Ychayyi Zinā gave his daughter in marriage to Ḥasan Khān, son of Kājī Chak; the daughter of Daulat Chak was married to Muḥammad Mākri, son of Abdāl Mākri; and the sister of Yūsuf Chak, son of Rēgi Chak, <sup>2</sup> Kōpwāri by name, was married by a *nikāh* ceremony to Ghāzī Khān. These alliances became the cause of the strength and power of the Chaks; and they, in concert with one another, went away to different parts of the country. Ghāzī Khān went to the country of Kamrāj, and Daulat Chak to Süyyapūr. The Mākris went to <sup>3</sup> Bānkāl; and ‘Idi Zinā remained at Srinagar in a sorrowful mood, and devised plans for their destruction.

As the season for egg fruits or *brinjals* now came, ‘Idi Zinā ordered that fowls and *brinjals* may be brought so that they be cooked together. This was a dish <sup>4</sup> much liked by the Kashmiris. Then Bahrām Chak and Saiyid Ibrāhīm and Saiyid Ya’qūb came at his invitation, but Yūsuf Chak did not come. ‘Idi Zinā had the three guests seized and imprisoned them. Yūsuf receiving information of this went away by way of Kamrāj with three hundred horsemen and seven hundred foot soldiers, and joined Daulat Chak. When ‘Idi Zinā saw that the Kashmiris had united with the Chaks, he released the

<sup>1</sup> The name is written very differently in the different MSS., etc. The MSS. have کشتواریان, and کہا واریان; while the lith. ed. has کہتواریان. Firishtah lith. ed. has کہپوریان. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 503) has Kapoories, and Rodgers (*J.A.S.B.*, vol. LIV, p. 122) has Kapūris. I prefer Kishtwāris as it means the people of Kishtwār, while the others have no meaning at all.

<sup>2</sup> The name is written as کویوادی and کویواری in the MSS. and کیواری in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has کتواری. The name is not given either by Col. Briggs or by Rodgers.

<sup>3</sup> Firishtah lith. ed. has باکل and Rodgers has Pākul, but the MSS. and the lith. ed. of the *Ṭabaqāt* have بانگل Bānkāl, which is the name of a pargana in S.W. part of Kamrāj. See page 371 of the *Ain-i-Akbarī* (Jarratt, vol. II) where it is Bānkāl, one of the south-west *pargana*hs.

<sup>4</sup> The word is مقور in both MSS. and the lith. ed. of the *Ṭabaqāt*. Firishtah lith. ed. has لطیف و مکرر.

Mughals, such as <sup>1</sup>Qarrā Bahādur Mirzā, ‘Abd-ur-raḥman Mirzā, Khān Mirak Mirzā, Shāhzāda Lang, Muḥammad Naẓr, and Ṣabr ‘Alī from prison; and showed favour to them; and giving each one of them a horse and <sup>2</sup>armour and some money remained at <sup>3</sup>Chakpūr.

At this time, Saiyid <sup>4</sup>Ibrāhīm and Saiyid Ya‘qūb, in concert with Jārūd, who was employed to guard them, fled; and going to Kamrāj joined Daulat Chak. Bahrām Chak could not escape. On the following day, Ghāzī Khān came to Srinagar with <sup>5</sup>three thousand horsemen. ‘Īdī Zinā sent the Mughals to fight with him; but he broke down the bridges, and so the Mughals could not do anything. At this time Daulat Chak also came, and joined Ghāzī Khān in Srinagar, and they joined together and took up a position in the ‘Īdgāh. There were constant skirmishes between the two parties, but Bābā Khalīl went to ‘Īdī Zinā in order to bring about a peace. He said, “You put your trust in the Mughals, and paid no regard to the Kashmīris. This was not right.” Having said words like this he effected a peace

<sup>1</sup> The names are as I have them in the text in the MSS. and in the lith. ed., with slight differences. In the Firishtah lith. ed. some of the names are different.

<sup>2</sup> The word used is *سِرپا* in one MS. and in the lith. eds. of the Ṭabaqāt and Firishtah, and *سروپا* in the other MS. I cannot find either *Sirpā* or *Siropā* in the dictionary. Rodgers has translated the word as armour, and I have adopted his translation. There is a Bengali or Hindi word *Siropā* (सिरोपा) which means an article of dress, e.g., a scarf, which can be worn as a mark of distinction; for instance, in certain places of pilgrimage various different kinds of *Siropās* are given to the pilgrims, according to the amounts offered by them to the presiding deity of the temple. *Siropā* may also mean something covering the head and feet.

<sup>3</sup> The name is Chakpūr in one MS. and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. In the other MS. and in the lith. ed. of the Ṭabaqāt it is چک پرتو Chakpartū.

<sup>4</sup> This passage with which Firishtah agrees word for word has been translated by Rodgers (*J.A.S.B.*, vol. LIV, p. 122) quite incorrectly as: “the Sayyids Ibrāhīm and Yaqūb by the help of the troopers escaped from prison, and joined Ghāzī Chakk at Kamrāj.” The name of the officer-in-charge is incorrectly given as جاردو Jārdū instead of جارود Jārūd in the text-edition.

<sup>5</sup> The numbers are very differently given. One MS. has *سی هزار سوار*. The lith. ed. has *سی هزار کس*. In the other MS. and Firishtah lith. ed. it is *سی سوار*; and this is followed in the text-edition. I am inclined to think that three thousand was the correct number.



After that, hostilities again commenced among the Kashmīrīs; and 'Īdī Zīnā, in concert with Fath Chak, <sup>1</sup> Lōhar Mākri, Yūsuf Chak, Bahrām Chak, and Ibrāhīm Chak came to <sup>2</sup> Khālidgarh, and took up residence there; and Daulat Chak, Ghāzī Khān, Ḥusain Mākri and Saiyid Ibrāhīm Khān and a band of <sup>3</sup> *Dūms* joining together, took up their quarters in the 'Īdgāh. When a period of two months had passed in this way, Yūsuf Chak, Fath Chak, <sup>4</sup> Lōhar Mākri son of Sahu, and Ibrāhīm Chak separated themselves from 'Īdī Zīnā; and joined Daulat Chak. Then Daulat Chak mounted with a large force advanced against 'Īdī Zīnā; and he being unable to meet them, fled without fighting; and went to the village of <sup>5</sup> Jharō. About this time he wanted to mount a horse, but by accident the horse kicked him on the chest, and he concealed himself in the village of <sup>6</sup> Samnāk; and he passed away from the world on account of the pain of the accident. They brought his body to Srīnagar; and buried it in

<sup>1</sup> The name is Kohrād Mākri in one MS.; but two lines further down it is Lōhar Dānkri and is Kōhar Dānkri and Lōhar Dānkri in the other and in the lith. ed. In Firishtah it is Kōhar Mākri. I have accepted Lōhar Mākri.

<sup>2</sup> The name is خالد کر Khāldkar and خالد کره Khāldkarah in the MS., and جاله کر Jālakar in the lith. ed. In the lith. ed. of Firishtah it is Khālidgarh, but Rodgers has Khāgarh.

<sup>3</sup> The MSS. have طایفه دو مان, and the lith. ed. of Firishtah has what also looks like طایفه دو ماء. The lith. ed. of the Ṭabaqāt has دو نان. I do not know what the طایفه دو مان would mean. دون of course means base, vulgar, etc. and طایفه دو نان may mean a group of the common people. Rodgers (*J.A.S.B.*, vol. LIV, p. 123) translates طایفه دو مان یکجا شد as "joining themselves together."

<sup>4</sup> See note 1 above. After لور دانگری words like ولنه شیو and لسه بهیو occur in the MSS. The lith. ed. has ولد سهو. Firishtah lith. ed. has no corresponding words. I have adopted the reading of the lith. ed. The text-edition has ولنه بهیو.

<sup>5</sup> The name is خيرو, and جبیره in the MSS., and جیرو in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has هرو or it may be مرو; and Rodgers (*J.A.S.B.*, vol. LIV, p. 123) has Merv. I cannot decide between these various readings, but I certainly do not consider that Merv is the correct reading. In the text-edition it is جیرو.

<sup>6</sup> The name is سمناک in the MSS., and the lith. ed. has سماک; but Rodgers has Simāle.

the <sup>1</sup> mausoleum of Mūsā Zinā. The *amīrs* then rebelled and excusing Nāzuk Shāh, who had nothing of the government except a name, from that also, determined on ruling <sup>2</sup> themselves.

(Nāzuk Shāh) ruled nominally for <sup>3</sup> two months, for the second time, after (the death of) Mīrzā Ḥaidar.

<sup>4</sup>AN ACCOUNT OF IBRĀHĪM SHĀH, SON OF MUḤAMMAD SHĀH,  
WHO WAS THE BROTHER OF NĀZUK SHĀH.

As 'Idī Zinā had passed away, Daulat Chak became the *Madār-ul-mulk*, and took up the management of affairs into his own hand. But when he saw, that there was no escape from having someone who should bear the name of Sultān, he raised Ibrāhīm Shāh to the seat of government, and kept him as a puppet. At this time Kḥwājah Ḥājī, the *vakīl* of Mīrzā Ḥaidar, came out of the <sup>5</sup> jungle; and went to Islām Kḥān. <sup>6</sup> And seizing Shams Zinā and Bahrām Chak put them into the prison. When the day of the 'Īd-i-fiṭr came, Daulat

<sup>1</sup> Rodgers (*J.A.S.B.*, vol. LIV, p. 123) translates در مزار موسی زینا as "in the village of Mūsā Zinā".

<sup>2</sup> The MSS. are incorrect. One has اراده خود کردند and the other اراده خود کردند سری. I have adopted the reading in the lith. ed. which is correct, and which is also the reading in the lith. ed. of Firishtah.

<sup>3</sup> The MSS. and the lith. ed. have for the second time. Firishtah lith. ed. has for the third time. Firishtah lith. ed. and Col. Briggs have two months, but Rodgers and the Cambridge History of India have ten months.

<sup>4</sup> That is the heading in the MS. as well as in the lith. ed. Firishtah however calls Ibrāhīm Shāh, the son of Nāzuk Shāh. Col. Briggs calls him brother of Nazuk Shah on one page, and his son in the next page. Rodgers and the Cambridge History of India, page 289, say that he was a son of Nāzuk Shāh.

<sup>5</sup> It is جنگل jungle in the MSS. and the lith. ed. of the Ṭabaqāt and Firishtah; but Rodgers (*J.A.S.B.*, vol. LIV, p. 123) has Khaigal, and he translates پیش اسلام شاه رفت as "took refuge with Islām Shāh."

<sup>6</sup> This is the reading in the MSS. and also in the lith. ed. The sentence has no nominative, and the verb کردند is in the plural. Firishtah lith. ed. has و درین وقت عیدی زینا و, then as in the Ṭabaqāt, which makes matters, if anything, worse, for the two defects pointed out remain, there is the additional difficulty that 'Idī Zinā was dead. I think the nominative should be Daulat Chak and the verb should be in the singular. Rodgers tides over the difficulty, by saying that Shams Zinā and Bahrām Chakk were thrown into prison, but he does not say by whom.

Chak having put his troops in order, came to the foot of the <sup>1</sup> Qabq (to practise archery). Yūsuf Chak also rode out to the foot of the Qabq. The runner or footman, who was collecting the arrows, came among the horse's legs. <sup>2</sup> The horse got entangled; and Yūsuf Chak fell from his horse, and his neck was broken.

In the year 960 A.H. hostility took place between Ghāzī Khān and Daulat Chak and there was very great dissension among the Kashmirīs. Husain Mākri and Shams Zīnā, who were in Hindūstān, came back; and in the year 961 A.H., joined Ghāzī Khān. <sup>3</sup> The sons of Yūsuf Chak and Bahrām Chak went to Daulat Chak. These disputes and dissensions continued for two months; but at length a husbandman, <sup>4</sup> in a spirit of impertinent interference, came to Daulat Chak, and said in his ears; "Ghāzī Khān has sent me to you to enquire why you have collected these unprincipled <sup>5</sup> men round you, as they are all your enemies." In the same way, he went to Ghāzī Khān,

<sup>1</sup> The word is قبق in one MS. It looks like قیق in one place and like صیق in another in the second; and it is فبق Fabq in both places in the lith. ed. In the lith. ed. of Firishtah it is قابوق in both places. Whatever the correct word is it seems to be the name of a hillock near Srinagar. Rodgers's translation (*J.A.S.B.*, vol. LIV, p. 123) is "outside the city."

<sup>2</sup> The words are اسپ مند شد in one MS. and the lith. ed., and اسپ بندرة شد in the other MS. Firishtah lith. ed. has no corresponding words. In the text-edition the reading اسپ تند شد has been adopted.

<sup>3</sup> Both MSS. and the lith. ed. have Yūsuf Chak and Bahrām Chak; but Yūsuf Chak had broken his neck; and Firishtah lith. ed. has the sons of Yūsuf Chak; so I have inserted the word sons before Yūsuf Chak in the translation. The text-edition has followed the manuscripts.

<sup>4</sup> The words are بعنوان فضول which Rodgers has translated "assuming the garb of an ambassador." The meaning is somewhat doubtful, but I think my translation is correct. The second word is فضولی in one MS. and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah, but it is فضول in the other MS. In the lith. ed. of the Ṭabaqāt the words from و این اختلاف to گفت are omitted, and in their place the words are و در گوش او گفتند, according to which the meaning would be that it was the sons of Yūsuf Chak and Bahrām Chak who spoke the words in Daulat Chak's ear.

<sup>5</sup> There is an adjective بی تقریب to the noun مردم in both the Ṭabaqāt and in Firishtah. Rodgers has omitted translating it. I think my translation is correct.

and said, "Daulat Chak intends to be at peace with you. Why are you quarrelling with him." Having said things like this he effected a settlement between them. Shams Zīnā then fled and went to Hindūstān.

At this time, some Tibetans came and drove away the flocks of sheep of *parganas* <sup>1</sup> Khāwah and Bārah, which were allotted as the *jāgīr* of Ḥabīb Chak, brother of Naṣrāt Khān. Daulat Chak sent Ibrāhīm Chak, Ḥaidar Chak, son of Ghāzī Khān and other chief men with a large army by way of Lār to invade great Tibet. Ḥabīb Khān himself advanced with great rapidity in pursuit of the Tibetans, by the road by which the flocks had been driven away. He suddenly came up to a fort of the Tibetans, fought with the garrison, and slew their commander by the sword. The rest all fled. Ḥabīb Khān encamped there, and said to Darvīsh Chak his brother, "Do you mount with the troops, and get into Tibet." Darvīsh Chak was negligent, and did not comply with his words. Ḥabīb Chak, in spite of his <sup>2</sup> wounds, which were still bleeding, mounted and got into the edifices and great mansions of Tibet. The Tibetans, being unable to oppose him, fled without attempting to fight. Forty of the men, who were clinging to the roof of one of the palaces, were seized. They made much importunities, and begged that they might not be killed. They also promised to give five hundred horses, one thousand <sup>3</sup> pieces of *pattū* (woollen cloth), fifty yāks and two hundred *tolas* of gold. Ḥabīb Chak paid no attention to their words, and hanged them all. He mounted and rode to another fort, and destroyed it also. The Tibetans sent three thousand horsemen, five hundred pieces of *pattū*, one hundred sheep and thirty yāks for his acceptance. He also

<sup>1</sup> The name of the *parganas* are as I have them in the text in one MS.; in the other they are دياره و دكها, and in the lith. ed. كهاه و پاره. Firishtah lith. ed. has دواره كهه and Rodgers (*J.A.S.B.*, vol. LIV, p. 124) has Khāwan and Bāra. I think, however, that the flocks were taken away only from one *pargana* that of Khāwarpārah which is one of the *pargana*hs to the N.E. of Śrinagar (see *Āin-i-Akbarī*, Jarratt, vol. II, p. 369).

<sup>2</sup> One MS. inserts between زخمها and خون میرفت the phrase که خورده بود وازو.

<sup>3</sup> The word is پارچه a segment, a piece. Rodgers has pieces.





1 AN ACCOUNT OF ISMA'IL SHĀH, BROTHER OF IBRĀHĪM SHĀH.

When five months had elapsed from (the beginning of) the rule of Ibrāhīm Shāh, which was in reality the rule of Daulat Chak, the times became propitious for Ghāzī Khān, and <sup>2</sup> Daulat Chak was slain. Ghāzī Khān became fully independent, but for name's sake raised Isma'il Shāh to the throne in the year 963 A.H. In this year, Ḥabīb Chak wanted to join Daulat Chak (it would appear that what was said about his being slain or defeated and blinded, as in Firishtah, was said in anticipation of a coming event) and with this determination he went towards <sup>3</sup> Mardā Dūn. Ghāzī Khān said to Naṣrat Chak, "Your brother Ḥabīb has joined Daulat Chak. It is right that before he arrives we should seize Daulat Chak, for after his arrival the matter

<sup>1</sup> That is the heading in one MS., in which however the name is اسماعیل instead of اسمعیل. In the other MS. and the lith. ed. the words بن علی شاه are added after Ibrāhīm Shāh, but it does not appear who 'Alī Shūh was. Ibrāhīm Shāh, according to the Ṭabaqāt, was a son of Muḥammad Shāh, and according to Firishtah a son of Nāzūk Shah (see p. 725 and note 4).

<sup>2</sup> The MSS. and the lith. ed. all say دولت چک بقتل رسید. Firishtah however says Daulat Chak مغلوب و مکبول گرهید, i.e., was defeated and fettered. Prājyabhaṭṭa's *Rājataranginī* has a curious story (see lines 523-535). It says दौलतचक्रकः (the change from Cakra to Cakka should be noted) attempted to stop the flow of water in the वेतालान्नभूमि. Thrown by the angry Vetālas (some kind of supernatural beings) stones fell into his house. He then went to a मदानपाः साधु known as अभिमन्यु, who lived in a village called Tūlamūla; and inquired of him, how the dominions could be rich and free from all fears. The *Sādhu* said मदाज्ञया वार्षिकं ब्राह्मणकरं निवारय. When Daulat Chak inquired how he could do such a thing, the *Sādhu* became रोषयाकुलमानस; and he cursed Daulat Chak. The curse also was curious सधुद्रमधमासाद्य चन्द्राकौ ते पतियतः, that is, the moon and sun will fall on your reaching the middle of the sea. After चमेसमिधमभूत् (i.e., I suppose Ibrāhīm Shāh) had reigned for one month, Ghāzī Khān himself in his avarice took his position (जयाच तत् पदं लोभाद्वाजखानस्ततः स्वयं).

I have included this long quotation as it appears to me to show a great increase of superstition and a great deterioration in the historical sense of the chronicler.

<sup>3</sup> The name is written as مردادون and مرار دول in the MSS. and مردادون in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. also has مردادون. I have retained the reading in the lith. ed., while the text-edition has مروادون.



latter out of prison and kill Ghāzī Khān." This news reached Ghāzī Khān. He won over Yūsuf Chak and Sankar Chak, and summoned them to his presence. Ḥabīb Chak, Naṣrat Chak and Darvīsh Chak declared, that they would either go (to Ghāzī Khān?) or would make their escape, after engagements and promises have been made in the presence of Qaḍīs and learned men. Naṣrat Chak went to Ghāzī Khān without any engagements, and was thrown into prison. Ḥabīb Chak, in concert with Nāzuk Chak, broke down the bridges, and rose in rebellion. Hastī Khān came with a large force and joined them. Ghāzī Khān sent a large army to attack them; and a great battle took place. Ghāzī Khān's army was, however, defeated, and some of his men were taken prisoners. Ḥabīb Chak having gained the victory went to <sup>1</sup> Māmūn. After his men had been defeated, Ghāzī Khān himself rode out to attack Ḥabīb Chak. He went to <sup>2</sup> Dūmrah, and having got hold of three or four boats crossed the river.

He had three elephants and three thousand men with him. When he arrived at the plain of Khālidgarh, Ḥabīb Chak came forward with <sup>3</sup> two thousand men, and engaged him in battle. After much fighting, Ḥabīb Chak got into the <sup>4</sup> Jamjah river; and his horse could not cross it. Hastī Tarīq, one of the servants of Ghāzī Khān, coming after

---

(*J.A.S.B.*, vol. LIV, p. 125) has translated the words, "was eaten up by physiso," which cannot be understood.

<sup>1</sup> The word is ماعون, and پاسول in the MS., and باسون in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has كوة ماعون, and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 509) has Hamoon; and Rodgers has mountains of Māmūn. I cannot find anything about any of these places, and have adopted Māmūn. The text-edition following the lith. ed. has باسون.

<sup>2</sup> There are different readings here. One MS. has در دومره رفته, the other has در دو مرتبه رفته, while the lith. ed. has روز مرة رفته. Firishtah lith. ed. has بدومره رفته. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 509) has "marched on to Domra"; and Rodgers (*J.A.S.B.*, vol. LIV, p. 125) has "went to Badūmara", which is certainly incorrect, as he has prefixed the proposition *Ba* to Dūmra and has made one word of them, I have adopted Dūmra, though I have failed to find its location. In the text-edition it is دو مرة apparently a misprint for دومره.

<sup>3</sup> The MSS. as well as the lith. ed. have گشت کس twenty men, but this is apparently incorrect. Firishtah has گشت صد twenty hundred, and I have inserted hundred after twenty; but the text-edition has followed the MSS.

<sup>4</sup> The name is چمجهه; and چمجهه in the MSS., and جانجه in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has چمجه پل Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 509) has "the

him, put his hand on his mouth, and brought him down. About that (time) Ghāzī Khān's elephant came there and he was seized. Ghāzī Khān ordered his *filbān* to cut off his head. When the *filbān* put his hand on Ḥabīb Chak's face (or into his mouth), the latter caught his fingers firmly and bit them. In the end his head <sup>1</sup> was severed from his body, and was taken to <sup>2</sup> Kalahmāt, where his house was; and hung there from the gallows. Ghāzī Khān also seized Darvīsh Chak and Nāzuk Chak, and had them hanged. After some time, Bahrām Chak came from Hindūstān to Ghāzī Khān; and the *pargana* of <sup>3</sup> Kahuna-hāmū was allotted as his *jāgīr*. He received permission to leave Srīnagar, and went to <sup>4</sup> Madanjah, in *pargana* Zaingar, which was his

Muchbul": and Rodgers (*J.A.S.B.*, vol. LIV, p. 125) has "at the bridge of Jamja."

Rodgers's translation (*J.A.S.B.*, vol. LIV, p. 125) of Firishtah's version "he was compelled to flee. At the bridge of Jamja his horse stuck fast", is not correct. The correct translation would be "his horse stuck fast in the river of the Jamja bridge". Prājyabhaṭṭa's *Rājatarāṅgiṇī* is rather difficult to follow in the later portions; but I think the following words refer to this incident नदौमुहङ्ग्य भूपालो युद्धं कृत्वा महेत्तरं । सितानदौप्रवाहेषु हमेचकूमसारयत् । (lines 551-52). It will be noticed that Ghāzī Khān is already described as Bhūpāla or king; and Ḥabīb Chak is transformed into Habhe Cakka and not Cakra. I hoped to be able to fix the locality by finding out something about the Sitā Nadi; but this has not been possible.

<sup>1</sup> The words *مر اورا از تن جدا کردند* occur in only one MS., but not in the other or in the lith. ed., but as this was necessary before it could be sent to the place of his residence, and as Firishtah has *مر اورا جدا کرده*, I have inserted them.

<sup>2</sup> The name is *كله باب* in one MS. and *كله بان* in the other, *كله باب* in the lith. ed. and *كله نامت* in Firishtah lith. ed. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 509) has Kulanamut, and Rodgers has only Kala thinking that the latter part of the name in Firishtah which is *نامت* means the name. Rodgers (*J.A.S.B.*, vol. IV, p. 126) translates the words *بردار کشیدند* which follow immediately afterwards, "hung it there on the door."

<sup>3</sup> The name is *كهونه نامو* in both MSS., and *كهونه ها* in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has *كهونه عامون*. Col. Briggs has Kohtahamoon, and Rodgers has Khuba or Khoba Hāmūn. The nearest I can get to these in the list of *pargana*hs in *Āin-i-Akbarī* (Jarratt, vol. II, p. 370) is Khoihāma, in the N.W. part of the Kamrāj tract. The text-edition has followed the MSS.

<sup>4</sup> The name is *مدنجه* and *امدنجه* in the MS., and *بدنجه* in the lith. ed. of the Ṭabaqāt and of Firishtah. *مدنجه* has been adopted in the text-edition.

birth-place. Then Sankar Chak and Fath Chak and others went to Bahrām; and they all came together to *pargana* Suyyapūr; and began to create disturbances. Ghāzī Khān sent his son and brothers to attack them. They were unable to meet them, and fled towards the hills. On the next day Ghāzī Khān went in pursuit of them; and when he arrived in the village of Madanjah, he selected two thousand men, whom he sent in pursuit of them, so that they might capture them. The next day news came that Bahrām, <sup>1</sup> having been hit by an arrow, had gone away to some (unknown) place; and Sankar Chak and Fath Chak had separated from him. Ghāzī Khān went with great rapidity to <sup>2</sup> Kahunahāmū, and for six days made great search to capture Bahrām. Ahmad Jaurin, <sup>3</sup> brother of Haidar Chak, son of Ghāzī Khān, was entrusted with the duty of capturing Bahrām. Ghāzī Khān himself returned to the city. Ahmad Jaurin went to Shēr-kōt, which was the abode of the <sup>4</sup> *Rishīs*, i.e., Sūfīs; and

---

<sup>1</sup> There are different readings and the meaning is not quite clear. The MSS. have *بهرام تیر (تیری) خورده بجای رفتہ* (or *تیری*). The lith. ed. has *هریمت* instead of *تیر* or *تیری*. Firishtah lith. ed. has *بهرام از سرکوب رفتہ*. Col. Briggs gives no translation of the passage. Rodgers (*J.A.S.B.*, vol. LIV, p. 126) has "Bahrām Chakk had escaped from Sarkob", taking Sarkob to be the name of a place, which I do not think is correct. It will be seen that a few lines further down the place is called Shēr-kōt in the *Ṭabaqāt*, though it is called Sarkōb there also in Firishtah. Shēr-kōt is apparently the correct name of the place.

<sup>2</sup> See page 732 and note 3.

<sup>3</sup> The MSS. as well as the lith. eds. of the *Ṭabaqāt* and of Firishtah all say *برادر حیدر چک ولد غازی خان*. I do not know why Ahmad Jaurin could not be called son of Ghāzī Khān, instead of being called the brother of his son. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 509) has Ahmud Hoorein, a son of Heidur Chuk brother of Ghazy Khan. This is probably correct. The words brother and son have become transposed.

<sup>4</sup> The name is written *ریشان* in the MSS. and the lith. ed. of the *Ṭabaqāt*. Firishtah lith. ed. has *ریشیان*. I think the latter to be the more correct form. Col. Briggs calls (vol. IV, p. 509) them Russies; and he thinks they were the inhabitants of a "convent of Russian missionaries being in Thibet"; for he argues the philosophical and horticultural Russies can be no other, though their being there is a very extraordinary fact. Rodgers simply calls them *Rishīs* or *Sufīs*. I have no doubt also that they were some kind of Sufīs, of whom there were apparently many sects in Kashmir (see *Tarikh-i-Rashidi*, p. 436). Mirza Haidar paints them in very dark colours, but some of them might have been peaceful rustics, as those mentioned here are described to have been.

seized them, and in order to make them produce Bahrām had them bastinadoed. The *Rishīs* said "We took Bahrām in a boat to the village of <sup>1</sup> Bādhal to the house of Amīr Zinū." The *Rishīs* are a community or a group of people, who always carry on agriculture and plant orchards, and <sup>2</sup> they live in a society by themselves and do not marry. <sup>3</sup> Aḥmad Jaurin went to Amīr Zinū, and after much search, got hold of Bahrām Chak; and took him to Srinagar. He was there hanged by the neck; and Aḥmad Jaurin received the title of Faṭḥ Khān.

<sup>4</sup> At this time, Shāh Abu-ul-ma'ālī, who was in the custody of the Khakars, came with fetters on his feet mounted on the back of Yūsuf Kashmīrī. When he arrived at Rājaurī, a band of Mughals collected round him. The blind Daulat Chak and Faṭḥ Chak and other Chaks and Lōhars and Ankrīs all came to him; and in the year 965 A.H., they advanced towards Kashmīr. When they arrived at Bārāmūla, Muḥammad Haidar and Faṭḥ Khān, who guarded the road,

<sup>1</sup> The name of the village is بادهل in both MSS., and ناديل in the lith. ed. of the *Ṭabaqūt*. In the lith. ed. of *Firishtah* it is باديلي. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 510) has Nādily and Rodgers (*J.A.S.B.*, vol. LIV, p. 126) Būdeli.

<sup>2</sup> I am not sure whether my translation is correct. The words in the *Ṭabaqūt* MS. and lith. ed. are اتفاق فرمايند و بتجريد گذرانند. The lith. ed. of *Firishtah* has گذرانند instead of گذرانند.

<sup>3</sup> The text in the *Ṭabaqūt* (MSS. and lith. ed.) is جورين امير زينا رفتہ is imperfect here. I have inserted Aḥmad before Jaurin, and have put in نرد امير زينا instead of امير زينا. In the text-edition it is جورين نرد اينه رفتہ.

<sup>4</sup> *Prājyabhaṭṭa's Rājataranginī*, which is very meagre and very incorrect in its later pages, has some account of Shāh Abu-ul-ma'ālī's invasion immediately after the mention of the death or slaying of Ḥabīb Chak in lines 551-52 (see note 4, pp. 731-32). It says गते वज्रविधे काले नोस्मीचक्रप्रचोदितः । आययौ सुगुप्तस्त्रासो श्रीकश्मीरजिगीषया । शब्द अन्दोस्त्रासोति नाम यस्याभवद्भवि । (lines 552-53). It is curious that Shāh Abul Ma'ālī should be called the Lord of the Mughals, when he was fleeing from them. I cannot identify Nosmī Cakka. The Cambridge History of India, page 290, describes the raid of Shah Abul Ma'ālī, as "the serious rebellion of Yūsuf Chakk who was supported by Shāh Ab-'l-Ma'ālī." This does not appear to me to be correct. No Yūsuf Chak is mentioned in connection with the reign, except one, who is said to have carried Shāh Abu-ul Ma'ālī on his back. If Yūsuf Chak should be identified with the Nosmī Cakka referred to in the early part of the note, there will be some foundation for the statement.

fled and went to the village of Bādūkhī. Shāh Abu-ul-ma'ālī, having adopted the path of justice, none of his soldiers had any power to oppress the *ra'iyats*. When he arrived in the village of <sup>1</sup> Bārbakla, which is near <sup>2</sup> Pattana, he encamped on high ground. Ghāzī Khān also marched out from Srinagar, and encamped in Pattana, in front of Shāh Abu-ul-ma'ālī. He made his brother named Husain, the commander of his vanguard, and stationed himself in <sup>3</sup> *maṇḍa* Khōd. The Kashmīris, who were with Shāh Abu-ul-ma'ālī, attacked without his permission, the army of Husain Khān, and compelled him to turn back. Ghāzī Khān, coming to his aid, fought with great gallantry, and having slain many of the Kashmīris defeated Shāh Abu-ul-ma'ālī. The latter seeing the state of things, without fighting turned his face to flight. When his horse became exhausted on the way, a Mughal came to him, and gave him his own horse which was fresh and strong. He then took hold of the exhausted horse, and stood on the spot, and kept back all the Kashmīris who were going in pursuit of Shāh Abu-ul-ma'ālī. When his quiver became empty, the Kashmīris advanced on him in a crowd, and slew him. During this time, Shāh Abu-ul-ma'ālī managed to make his escape. Ghāzī Khān then turned back and went to Pattana. He ordered every Mughal, who was brought before him, to be beheaded except Hafiz (one who has memorised the *Qurān*) Ḥabshī, one of the readers of His

<sup>1</sup> The name of the village is مار کله and مار بله in the MSS., and باربکله in the lith. ed. of the Ṭabaqāt. In the lith. ed. of Firishtah it is باره پوله. The text-edition following the first MS. has مار کله.

<sup>2</sup> Pattana or Patan is on the side of the ancient Śaṃkarapura and lies on the direct road between Śrinagar and Bāramūla. According to Prājyabhaṭṭa (l. 555) आससाद् च भूपालः परिहासपुरान्तिकं where I think Ghāzī Khān is referred to in the words च भूपालः. I cannot find out the distance between Parihāsapura and Pattana, but seeing that "Śaṃkaravarman is said to have carried off 'whatever was of value in Parihāsapura' in order to raise the fame of his own town" of Śaṃkarapura, where Pattan now stands (*vide* Stein's *Rājataranginī*, vol. II, p. 481), it could not have been very great. In the text-edition the name of the village is given as بین.

<sup>3</sup> The name in both MSS. is کہود. The lith. ed. says incorrectly در یکموضع استاد. Firishtah lith. ed. has کنہور. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 510) has Gahwar and Rodgers (*J.A.S.B.*, vol. LIV, p. 126) has Khanūd. In the text-edition the reading in the MSS. has been followed.



Majesty Jinnat Ashiānī, whom he did not slay on account of the beauty of his recitation.

After this victory (Ghāzī Khān) released Naṣrat Chak out of prison, and sent him to wait upon His Majesty, the asylum of the *Khilāfat* (Akbar). Naṣrat Chak went, and saw the Khūn Khānān Bahrām Khān, and the latter showed him all honour and respect.

In the year 966 A.H., there was a change in the disposition of Ghāzī Khān; and <sup>1</sup> he began to act with tyranny and oppression, and the people showed great detestation of him. At this time a report was conveyed to his ears, that his son, in concert with some people, wanted to seize the kingdom. Ghāzī Khān summoned <sup>2</sup> Muḥammad Ṣadūr, who was his *vakīl* (representative or agent), and Bahādur Bhat, and said, "People say this." They said, "What they say is true." Ghāzī Khān told them, "Give him good advice, so that he may not again allow such a thought to enter his mind." Muḥammad Ṣadūr called Ḥaidar Chak to his house, and reasoned with him, and abused him. Ḥaidar Chak got into a rage, and forcibly took the dagger from Muḥammad's belt, and struck it in his stomach and killed him on the spot. Men came in a crowd, and seized Ḥaidar; and Ghāzī Khān gave the order for slaying him. In the end he was executed and his head was taken to Zaingarh, and there hung from

<sup>1</sup> Instances of his barbarity and cruelty are given in lines 558, etc. of Prājyabhaṭṭa's *Rājatarāṅgiṇī*. Among these is mentioned the slaying of his son named Ḥaidar, but the circumstances surrounding the incidents are somewhat difficult to understand. It is said in line 560 मातुलं खं जिघांसनं यौवनखं प्रतापिनं । चणाज्जघान भूपालः खसुतं देदराभिधं ॥ This can only be explained on the supposition that *مادر* or *جنيد* (see the next note) was the maternal uncle of Ḥaidar. Prājyabhaṭṭa goes on to say that there was a great wail of lamentation on the execution of Ḥaidar (दुरात्मना । जनः पुत्रोऽप्यनेनेति हाहाकारो महानभूत् —l. 561), which shows that the people were in sympathy with the son or at least were grieved over his death, and were hostile to Ghāzī Khān; and it is also said अष्टादशभवंसस्य युवराजस्य सन्निधः । सुताज्जघान भूपाल उन्मत्त इव राक्षसः । (l. 562) which means that Ghāzī Khān like a mad Rākṣasa had the eighteen councillors of the prince executed. I cannot understand the word सुतान् in this line. It may be a printer's mistake for स तान्. The description of Ghāzī Khān as a mad Rākṣasa shows the intensity of the popular hatred towards him.

<sup>2</sup> The name is Muḥammad Ṣadūr in one MS. and in the lith. ed. In the other MS. it is Muhammad Ṣadū. The name is Muḥammad Junaid in *Firishtah*.

a gibbet. Ghāzī Khān also had the men, who had conspired with him (Haidar), put to death.

In the year 967 A.H., Qarrā Bahādur came from Hindūstān with a large army and nine elephants; and he had with him <sup>1</sup> Naṣrat Chak and Faṭḥ Chak and others from among the Kashmīrīs and also a large body of Khakars. He waited for three months at <sup>2</sup> Lālīpūr. He had great hopes that the Kashmīrīs would join him; but at this time Naṣrat Khān and Faṭḥ Chak and Lōharī and Ankri fled from him and went to Ghāzī Khān. Owing to this, great weakness crept into Qarrā Bahādur's army. Ghāzī Khān came out of Kashmīr and arrived in Naurōzkōt. (He) sent some foot-soldiers against him and defeated him. Qarrā Bahādur fled and got into the fort of Dāiyarah. The following day he fled from the foot-soldiers; and his elephants fell into the hands of the Kashmīrīs; and five hundred Mughals were put to death.

When a period of five years of the rule of Ḥabīb Shāh had passed, Ghāzī Khān concealed him in a corner, raised the standard of his own rule, did not allow even the name of sovereignty to another, and had the public prayers read and the coins struck in his own name, and gave himself the title of Ghāzī Shāh.

### <sup>3</sup> AN ACCOUNT OF THE RULE OF GHĀZĪ KHĀN.

Ghāzī Khān, having ascended the throne according to the custom of the rulers of Kashmīr, commenced giving himself the titles of *Bādshāh* and *Sultān*. Owing to <sup>4</sup> leprosy, with which he had before this been afflicted, his voice at this time underwent a change; and his

<sup>1</sup> The name is Naṣrat Khān Chak in one MS. It is omitted in the other. In the lith. ed. both of the Ṭabaqāt and of Firishtah it is Naṣrat Chak.

<sup>2</sup> The name is Lālīpūr in the MS. as well as the lith. ed. of the Ṭabaqāt. It is Lālāpūr in the lith. ed. of Firishtah.

<sup>3</sup> The heading is as I have it in the text-edition, in both MSS. and the lith. ed. Firishtah has ذکر حکومت عازی شاه, which is better.

<sup>4</sup> The attack of leprosy and the death of Ghāzī Khān or Shāh are described in Prājyabhaṭṭa's *Rājataranṅinī*, lines 563–567. It, however, omits all the incidents which are mentioned in the Ṭabaqāt and Firishtah, as having occurred after his assumption of the royal title.

fingers were about to drop off, and there were ulcers in his gums (*dar dandān*, i.e., in his teeth). In the year 968 A.H., Fath Khān and Lōharī and Ankrī and other Kashmiris became suspicious of him, and fleeing got into the hilly country. Ghāzī Khān sent his brother Husain Khān with two thousand men in pursuit of them. As it was the season of snow, Husain Khān, on arrival at <sup>1</sup> Baḥarārah, made a halt. The enemy getting warning, went to the village of <sup>2</sup> Ahlan; and a large number of them, falling under the snow, perished. The rest, who survived, went to <sup>3</sup> Kishtwār, and in the year 969 A.H., they were in great distress there, and sought an asylum with Husain Khān. The latter prayed to Ghāzī Khān to pardon their offences, and he pardoned them, and gave them good *jāgīrs*.

In the year 970 A.H., Ghāzī Khān left Kashmir, and took up his residence at Lār; and sent his son Aḥmad Khān in concert with Fath Khān and <sup>4</sup> Nāṣir Kiyānī and other renowned *amīrs* for the conquest of Tibet. When they arrived within five *karōhs* of Tibet, Fath Khān went into (invaded) Tibet <sup>5</sup> with the permission of Aḥmad Khān; and getting among the Tibetans <sup>6</sup> came out quickly. The Tibetans

<sup>1</sup> The name is بحرارة, and بحرارة in the MSS., Firishtah lith. ed. has left out a considerable number of words from برف بود بخبردار, and Col. Briggs and Rodgers have followed it.

<sup>2</sup> The name is Ahlan in both MSS., and Aslan in the lith. ed.

<sup>3</sup> The name is كهوار in both MSS., and كتوار in the lith. ed. of the Ṭabaqāt, and كهتوار in the lith. ed. of Firishtah.

<sup>4</sup> The name is ناصر کيانی in both MSS., and ناصر کتانی in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has ناصر کتابی, but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 513) transliterates as Nasir Kutaby, and Rodgers (*J.A.S.B.*, vol. LIV, p. 128) has Nāṣir Kibatu.

<sup>5</sup> The MSS. as well as the lith. ed. of the Ṭabaqāt have برخصت, i.e., with the permission; but Firishtah lith. ed. has بی رخصت, without the permission; and the subsequent incident shows that the latter reading is probably correct.

<sup>6</sup> The reading in the Ṭabaqāt is در میان تبتيان درآمده زود بدر آمد. The penultimate word is بدر in one MS. which I have adopted. In the other MS. and in the lith. ed. it is بر. Firishtah lith. ed. has a different reading; it is بشهر در آمد after رفته. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 514) translates this in the words, "proceeded to the capital"; and Rodgers (*J.A.S.B.*, vol. LIV, p. 129) has "went into the city" without specifying what city. It is very doubtful that Fath Khān reached as far as the Capital of Tibet.

were unwilling to fight, and sent much tribute. <sup>1</sup> At this time the idea came into Aḥmad K̲h̲ān's mind, "Fath K̲h̲ān went into Tibet, and came out. If I do not do a similar deed, the people of Kashmīr will all praise him." Then he determined that he should go *jaridah* (alone, or with a small retinue). Fath K̲h̲ān said, "It is not advisable that you should go; and indeed if you must go, go with a large force." Aḥmad K̲h̲ān did not listen to his words, and went with only five hundred men. He left Fath K̲h̲ān in the camp. When the Tibetans saw that he had such a small force, they attacked him. He was unable to withstand them, and fled; on coming to Fath K̲h̲ān said, "Today thou be the rearguard. I am off." He did not delay anywhere. When the men saw, that Aḥmad K̲h̲ān was running away, they all turned their faces in flight. Fath K̲h̲ān, however, halted. The Tibetans came up to him; he fought single handed with them; and was slain. On hearing this news Ghāzī K̲h̲ān got into a rage, and strongly <sup>2</sup> criticised his son's conduct.

<sup>3</sup> The period of Ghāzī K̲h̲ān's rule was four years.

<sup>1</sup> Firishtah agrees, except in the latter part, where he says *و او برویه و نا هیچ توقف نکرده پیش شد تبیان باو رسیده چون تنها دیدند بچنگ پرداختند*. The versions both in Col. Briggs and Rodgers are altogether wrong, but it would be useless to point out all their mistakes. The Cambridge History of India, page 290, gives a short summary, as follows: "His advanced guard was defeated, and instead of pressing forward to its support he fled with the main body of the force." Every statement in this sentence appears to me to be incorrect. The advanced guard was not defeated, and in fact there was no advance guard; and Aḥmad K̲h̲ān could not have pressed forward to its support. He was, in fact, running away, the main body running away with him; and it was only Fath K̲h̲ān, whom, when he was running away, Aḥmad K̲h̲ān implored or ordered to be the rearguard; and he fought bravely and was killed. It is unfortunate that a history which is believed to be a standard work should contain such a statement. The compiler, apparently, read neither the Ṭabaqūt nor Firishtah; and apparently not even the incorrect translations of Col. Briggs or Rodgers.

<sup>2</sup> The word *اعراض* (honours, reputations) in the text-edition is apparently a misprint for *اعتراض* (criticism, animadversion).

<sup>3</sup> The account of the reign of Ghāzī Shāh appears to end thus abruptly both in the Ṭabaqūt and in Firishtah; but as a matter of fact it is continued in the earlier part of the account of the reign of Ḥusain K̲h̲ān or Shāh.

<sup>1</sup> AN ACCOUNT OF ḤUSAIN KHĀN, BROTHER OF GHĀZĪ KHĀN:

In the year 971 A.H., Ghāzī Khān left Kashmir with the intention of conquering Tibet; and took up his quarters in <sup>2</sup> Maukhadah Khār; but owing to an acute attack of leprosy he lost the use of his eyes; and adopted bad manners and perpetrated tyranny on the people, and extorted sums of money as fines from innocent men. The people being aggrieved at his conduct, divided themselves into two parties. One of them united with his son Aḥmad Khān; and the other joined his brother Ḥusain Khān. On hearing this, he came back to Srinagar; and as he had more affection and kindness for Ḥusain Khān, he raised him in his place to the *salṭanat*. The *vakīls* and *vazīrs* of Ghāzī Khān all went to Ḥusain Khān's house, and began to serve him. After fifteen days Ghāzī Khān divided all his equipages and rich stuffs into two portions. One share he gave to his sons, and made over the other moiety to tradesmen, and ordered that they should pay him its price. The tradesmen came to Ḥusain Khān praying for justice. The latter forbade Ghāzī Khān (to effect the sale and demand the price). Ghāzī Khān being annoyed with him wanted to make his son his successor. Ḥusain Khān, on being informed of this, summoned Aḥmad Khān, son of Ghāzī Khān, Abdāl Khān and other chief men; and took pro-

<sup>1</sup> The heading is as I have it in the text in both the MSS. and in the lith. ed. Firishtah has *ذکر سلطنت حسین شاه*, which is better. The Cambridge History of India, page 290, says that the new ruler ascended the throne as Nāsir-ud-dīn Husain Shāh.

The accession of Ḥusain Khān or Shāh is mentioned in line 575 of Prājyabhaṭṭa's *Rājatarīṅgiṇī*, and the following lines describe his impartial justice, his prosperity, his fame and his pleasure, in respect of which, it says *सुखं तत्सदृशं स्वर्गे च चकार न वाच्यः ।* (l. 578), i.e., even *Indra* did not have such pleasure in *Svarga*. The happiness of the people is described in line 583, which says *दुर्मिचचौरराजभ्यो भये तेन निवारिते । अस्मिन् स्वर्गसदृशं लोकः कश्मीरमण्डलं ।* i.e., famine, robberies and fear from kings having been prevented by him, the people thought Kashmir to be like *Svarga*.

<sup>2</sup> The name is *موکده کهار* Maukhadah Khār in both MSS. It is Maukandah in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has Maulad Khār. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 514) has Mokudkar and Rodgers (*J.A.S.B.*, vol. LIV, p. 129) has Muladghar, which is, however, not a correct transliteration of the name as given in the lith. ed. of Firishtah, where the last syllable is *کهار* ghār, or may be ghār but not ghar.

mises and engagements from them, that they would remain obedient to him. Ghāzī Khān summoned and collected his own men and the Mughals. Husain Khān also prepared to meet him. The people and the *Qīdīs* intervened, and quelled the disturbance. Ghāzī Khān came out of the city, and took up his quarters in Zainpūr; but after three months he came back to Srinagar. Husain Khān <sup>1</sup> divided the country of Kashmir among men.

In the year 972 A.H., Husain Khān granted Rājauri and Nau Shahr *jīgir* to Sankar Chak, his elder brother, and sent him there. Immediately after this news came, that Sankar Chak had risen in revolt. (Husain Khān) then allotted the *jīgirs* to Muḥammad Mākri, and sent a large force against Sankar Chak. <sup>2</sup> The commanders of the force were Ahmad Khān, Fath Khān and Khwājah Mas'ūd <sup>3</sup> Nāyāk. They went, and fighting with Sankar defeated him. Husain Khān advanced to welcome them, and brought them to Srinagar. After some time Husain Khān learnt, that Ahmad Khān and Muḥammad Khān Mākri and Nasrat Khān had made plans for murdering him and wanted to imprison them. They on learning this came to Husain Khān with a large number of followers, and he was unable to harm them in any way. When they left his presence, <sup>3</sup> he became anxious (knowing) that they had become acquainted with the true state of things. He.

<sup>1</sup> Similar divisions have been made by other Sultāns also, but the reasons of such divisions is not clear. Firishtah preface, the statement by saying *حسن چک اسنڈال کلی بہم رسانید*, but I do not think it gives any sufficient reasons.

<sup>2</sup> There are differences in the readings. One MS. has *سرکردان*, while the other and the lith. ed. has *سرداران*. Then one MS. has *احمد خان و فتح خان*, while the lith. ed. has *احمد خان و محمود و بامک*, while the lith. ed. has *احمد خان و فتح خواجہ و محمود بامک*. Firishtah lith. ed. has *احمد خان و فتح خان چک و خواجہ محمود و بامک چک*. I was inclined at first to adopt the reading in Firishtah, but I found that the construction of the sentence in the *Ṭabaqāt* is different, so I have adopted the reading in the first MS., though I am not quite sure about the last word. In the text-edition M. Hidayat Husain has *محمود بامک* in place of *محمود نایک* in the translation above.

<sup>3</sup> The readings are slightly different. One MS. has *ممتفکر شد کہ*, while the other and the lith. ed. have *ممتفکر شدند*. I have adopted the first reading.

therefore, sent <sup>1</sup> Malik Lūli Laund to them, with the message, that they should all meet together; and make promises and engagements that none of them would attempt any hostility to the others. Malik Lūli Laund went and made proposals of peace. They then all came together in the house of Aḥmad Khān, and agreed that they should take Aḥmad Khān to the house of Ḥusain Khān. Aḥmad Khān, after much pressing consented; and went with Naṣrat Khān and Malik Lūli to Ḥusain Khān's house. Qāḍī Ḥabīb, who was one of the chief men of Kashmīr, and Muḥammad Mākri were also sent for. They all met together in the *Dīwānkhāna*, which is celebrated as the *Rang Maḥal*. When night came Ḥusain Khān said, <sup>2</sup> "We are inclined to-night to have some *natūah-bāzi*. As the Qāḍī is puritanical, you go together to the first floor (*bālākhāna*) (and amuse yourselves); and I am also coming." When they went upstairs, "Ḥusain Khān sent some men and had them imprisoned."

After that, he sent 'Ālam Khān and Khān Zamān, whose original name was Faṭḥ Khwājah, with a large army to attack Sankar Chak, who was near Rājaurī. They went there and defeated Sankar Chak;

<sup>1</sup> The name is as I have it in the text, in both MSS. and in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has ملک لوندنی لوند. Col. Briggs does not mention the name. Rodgers (*J.A.S.B.*, vol. LIV, p. 130) has Lodni Lond. Laund according to the dictionary means a soldier or an adventurer. It also, I think, means a Levantine, but I cannot understand how a Levantine should have made his way to Kashmīr.

<sup>2</sup> The text is imperfect and contradictory. One MS. has چون قاضی متشرع چون متشرع است شما با اتفاق. The other has چون متشرع است شما با اتفاق قاضی ببالاخانه رفتہ صحبت دارید کہ من ہم می ایم. The lith. ed. has چون قاضی متشرع است شما با اتفاق قاضی بہ بالاخانه رفتہ صحبت بدارید کہ من ہم می ایم. The lith. ed. of Firishtah has the same reading as the lith. ed. of the *Ṭabaqāt*, but leaves out the word Qāḍī. I consider this reading the best and have adopted it for the reason mentioned below.

I cannot find the meaning of بنتو بازی. *Bāzī* means a game or play. In a preceding note I have said that *Natuah* is probably a corruption of Sanskrit *Naṭa*, an actor or a mimic. As there is a reference to the Qāḍī's being orthodox or puritanical, the *natuah-bāzī* in this case was probably some kind of indecent mimicry or acting; but according to the text in the lith. ed. of the *Ṭabaqāt*, the Qāḍī was also invited to go to the *Bālākhāna*, where the game would be played. If the text of the lith. ed. of Firishtah is adopted and the word Qāḍī is omitted then there would be no difficulty.

and returned with victory and triumph. *Khān Zamān* having acquired much credit, an order was passed that all the *amīrs* should go every day to his house.

In the year 973 A.H., (people) slandered *Khān Zamān* to *Husain Khān*. The latter ordered that men should not go to his house. *Khān Zamān* wished to go away from Kashmīr, and was arranging to get together the things that would be required for the journey. <sup>1</sup> Then *Husain Khān* went away on a hunting expedition. <sup>2</sup> *Shams Dūbar* came and said to *Khān Zamān*, "Why are you going away; *Husain Khān* is gone out for hunting, and his house is unoccupied. We should go there, and take possession of all his equipages and treasure." *Khān Zamān* liked these words of his, and went in concert with *Fath Chak* and *Lōhar* and *Ankarī* and others like them, and attacked *Husain Khān's* house. They set fire to the door, and wanted to bring out *Aḥmad Khān*, *Muḥammad Khān Mākri* and *Naṣrat Khān* from prison. *Bahādur Khān* son of *Khān Zamān* and *Fath Chak* then came there. *Mas'ūd Nāyak* was in charge of the prison. He discharged water on the courtyard of the *Dīwānkhāna*, so that it became muddy. *Daulat Khān* one of *Husain Khān's* men was

<sup>1</sup> One MS. has by mistake *امد حسن شکاری*. The lith. ed. of *Firishtah* has *که حسین مکاری آمده بخان زمان گفت*.

<sup>2</sup> There are differences in the readings here. One MS. has *حسین خان بشکار*. *رفته خانه او خالی است بخانه او باید رفت*. The other MS., which has the incorrect reading mentioned in the preceding note, has *پس شمش دو برآمده بخانه مان گفت چرا بدر میروی حسین خان بکار رفت خانه او خالیست بخانه او باید رفت*. The reading in the lith. ed. is the same as the reading in the 2nd MS., but instead of *پس شمش دو برآمده* there is *ششور در نویر آمده* which appears to be incorrect. I have adopted the readings in the 2nd MS., though I am doubtful as to who *Shams Dūbar* was. In the text-edition it is *مکاری آمده حسین*. Besides, it was not likely, that because *Husain Khān* had gone away hunting, his house should remain unoccupied. *Prājyabhaṭṭa* refers to this in line 585. The line runs *खानेजमाननासामभून्तौ तस्य महीभृतः । स निर्गते महीपाले चक्षुन् नगरं क्षणम् ।* Then there are some lines which appear to be an interpolation; after which line 586 runs as *तदीयसैन्यमागत्य नाशयासास तत्क्षणं । हंसैन्यपतिः प्रातः रत्नकारमिवांशुमान् ।* These two lines (585, 586) mean that the king had a minister named *Khān Zamān*, who, when the king went out, seized the city in a moment. Then the king's troops came and destroyed (him) at once. The king was like the morning sun which destroys the darkness.



standing with his quiver on his back. Bahādur Khān ran to him; and struck him with his sword. The sword fell on his quiver; and he shot an arrow into the eye of Bahādur Khān's horse, which reared up, and threw the rider. <sup>1</sup> Mas'ūd Nāyak and Ankri attacked him, and cut off his head with a dagger. Khān Zamān received information of this from outside and fled. Mas'ūd Nāyak pursued and seized him, and took him to Husain Khān. The latter ordered that he should be carried to Zaingarh; and his ears and nose and hands and feet should be cut off, and he should be hung from a gibbet. He also gave the designation of son to Mas'ūd Nāyak, and honoured him with the title of Mubārīz Khān, and allotted the <sup>2</sup> *pargana* of Bānkāl as his *jāgīr*.

<sup>3</sup> In the year 974 A.H., Husain Khān ordered that the blinding needle to be drawn across the eyes of Aḥmad Khān, son of Ghāzī Khān, Naṣrat Khān and Muḥammad Khān. Ghāzī Khān, on hearing this news, suffered great anguish, and as he was already ill, he passed away.

Husain Khān then founded a college, and lived in the society of pious and learned men in its precincts, and he allotted them the *pargana* of <sup>4</sup> Zainpūr as their *jāgīr*.

In the year 975 A.H., Lūli Laund informed Husain Khān that Mubārīz Khān says that as Husain Khān had called him his son, he

<sup>1</sup> These names are variously written. One MS. has رخت ماریک وایری. the other has مانک وایری. The lith. ed. of the *Ṭabaqāt* has نازک و انکری; while that of *Firishtah* has مسعود نایک و انکری. The latter appears to me to be correct and I have adopted it.

<sup>2</sup> One of the *parganas* in the S.W. part of Kamrāj. See page 371, *Āin-i-Akbarī* (Jarratt, vol. II, p. 370).

<sup>3</sup> This is also mentioned by *Prājyabhaṭṭa* (l. 588) which runs विरोधे कृतबुद्धीनां वैरसंसक्तचेतसां । मल्लदखानकादीनां चकष्य नयनानि सः । i.e., he pulled out the eyes of Muḥammad Khān and others who were determined to fight with him, and whose hearts were filled with enmity towards him.

<sup>4</sup> The name of the *pargana* looks like بلانور and سالور in the MSS., and as نیالپور in the lith. ed. In the lith. ed. of *Firishtah* it is Zainpūr. In the list of *parganas* in *Āin-i-Akbarī* (Jarratt, vol. II, pp. 368-371) there is none that at all resembles any of the names in the MSS. or the lith. ed. of the *Ṭabaqāt*. There is, however, a *pargana* called Zinapur among those to the S.E. of Srinagar. I have, therefore, substituted the name of Zainpūr, and this is followed in the text-edition.

should give him a share of the treasure. Ḥusain Khān was much pained in his heart. One day he went to the house of Mubārīz Khān. He saw many horses in his stables. The pain in his mind became more acute; and he ordered Mubārīz Khān to be imprisoned. All affairs were now entrusted to Malik Lūlī. But in a short time he also was imprisoned on the ground that he had embezzled <sup>1</sup> forty thousand donkey-loads of paddy belonging to the government; and ‘Alī Kōkah was appointed in his place.

In the year 976 A.H., Qādī Ḥabīb, who was of the *Ḥanafī* faith, coming out of the *Jāma’* Mosque on a Friday <sup>2</sup> had gone to the foot of Mārān hill on a pilgrimage to the tomb; when a <sup>3</sup> *Rāfḍī* of the name of <sup>4</sup> Yūsuf Andāz drew his sword, and struck the Qādī. The latter was wounded on the head. Yūsuf again struck him with the sword. The Qādī shielded his head with his hand, and his fingers were cut off. Except the bigotry that was due to the difference of their religions there was nothing else between them. Maulānā Kamāl-ud-dīn, the son-in-law of the Qādī, <sup>5</sup> who occupied himself with teaching in Sīālkōt, was with him at the time. Yūsuf fled after wounding the Qādī. When Ḥusain Khān heard this news, he appointed some men who found Yūsuf out, and brought him. Ḥusain Khān then assembled lawyers like Mullā Yūsuf, Mullā Fīrūz, and others like them, and ordered them that they should state whatever might be in accordance with the law (*Shara’*). They replied, that the execution of such a person by way of punishment was legal. The Qādī said, “It would

<sup>1</sup> Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 517) incorrectly translates چهل هزار خورار شالی as “forty thousand bales of shawls”, and Rodgers (*J.A.S.B.*, vol. LIV, p. 131) also incorrectly has “40,000 ass-loads of shawls.”

<sup>2</sup> Rodgers (*J.A.S.B.*, vol. LIV, p. 131) translates در پای کوه ماران بزیارت “came to the zīārat in the graveyard of Yāfīkoh Mārān.”

<sup>3</sup> A man belonging to a section of the *Shī’a* sect, who renounced their allegiance to Zaid, the son of ‘Alī, the son of Ḥusain. Firishtah calls Yūsuf a *Shī’a*.

<sup>4</sup> That is the name in both the MSS. In the lith. ed. it is Yūsuf Tandōz. Firishtah lith. ed. has only Yūsuf. Neither Col. Briggs nor Rodgers has any name. In the text-edition M. Hidayat Ḥosain has adopted یوسف اندر.

<sup>5</sup> It is invidious to go on pointing out Rodgers’s mistakes, but he translates (*J.A.S.B.*, vol. LIV, p. 131) the clause که در سیالکوٹ بندریس اشتغال داشت - نیز همراه قاضی بود in the words, “was also with him engaged in reading.”

not be right to execute this man, so long as I am alive." In the end, they stoned him to death. Members of the sect, who were united with Yūsuf in religion and faith, said to Ḥusain Khān, "There has been too much haste in executing him." Ḥusain Khān said, "I acted in accordance with the verdict of the Mullās."

About this time Mirzā Muqīm, and Ya'qūb, son of Bābā 'Alī came to Kashmīr as ambassadors from the threshold of the servants of the asylum of the *Khilāfat*. When they arrived at Hiralpūr, Ḥusain Khān sent men to welcome them, and he himself came to the plain of <sup>1</sup> Sālāh; and erected a pavilion and awnings and all the furniture of an assembly. When he heard that the ambassadors had come near, he came out of the pavilion and greeted them. Then they all came into the pavilion, and sat down in one place. After that the ambassadors got into a boat, and Ibrāhīm Khān, the son of Ḥusain Khān, also went with them. Ḥusain Khān did not go in the boat, but went to Kashmīr (Srinagar) on horseback. He allotted the house of Ḥusain Mākri to the ambassadors.

After some days Mirzā Muqīm said, "Send the *Qādī* and the *Muftīs*, according to whose decision Yūsuf was executed, to me." Ḥusain Khān sent the *Muftīs* to him. *Qādī* Zain who was of the same religion as Yūsuf said, "The *Muftīs* made a mistake in their verdict." The *Muftīs* said, "We did not give a decisive verdict for his execution. We said that the execution of such a person by way of punishment was lawful." Mirzā Muqīm insulted the *Muftīs* in the assembly; and made them over to Fath Khān *Rāfī* and tortured them. Ḥusain Khān embarked in a boat and went away to Kamrāj. Fath Khān had the *Muftīs* put to death, by order of Mirzā Muḥammad Muqīm, and had their bodies dragged round the lanes and bazārs by ropes tied to their feet. Ḥusain Khān sent his daughter with fine gifts and presents with the ambassador for the service of the asylum of the *Khilāfat*. The ambassadors taking his daughter and the <sup>2</sup> tribute with them went back to Āgra.

<sup>1</sup> That is the name in both MSS. The lith. ed. has in the plain of Shāh-zāda. Firāshah does not mention the name of the place.

<sup>2</sup> One MS. inserts وهدایا after پیشکش and both have رسیدند instead of رفتند. I think رفتند is better and I have retained it. It is رسیدند in the text-edition.

<sup>1</sup>AN ACCOUNT OF 'ALĪ SHĀH, BROTHER OF ḤUSAIN.

In the year 977 A.H., news came that His Majesty the Khalīfa-i-Ilāhī had ordered Mīrzā Muqīm to be executed, in retribution of the unjust executions which he had perpetrated in Kashmīr; and he had also rejected Ḥusain Khān's daughter. On hearing this news, Ḥusain Khān had an attack of dysentery or bloody flux, and he continued to be ill for three or four months.

At this time, <sup>2</sup> Muḥammad Bhat incited Yūsuf, son of 'Alī Khān, to rebel against Ḥusain Khān. When this news reached Ḥusain Khān, he said to Yūsuf to go to his father, *i.e.*, 'Alī Khān, who was at <sup>3</sup> Sūyyapūr and to remain there. When Yūsuf went to 'Alī Khān, other men also fled one after another, and went to 'Alī Khān. When the going of the people, and also of his son to 'Alī Khān became a certainty, Ḥusain Khān sent men to 'Alī Khān with this message: "What offence has been committed by me? I sent your son to you without any objection or censure." 'Alī Khān said: "I also am not guilty in any way. People come to me fleeing from you; and although I advise them, it has no effect."

<sup>1</sup> The heading is as I have it in the text in both MSS. and the lith. ed. The account of Ḥusain's reign ends abruptly, but some account of it is continued in that of the next reign. Prājyabhaṭṭa does not mention the incident of Qāḍī Ḥabīb or of the arrival of Akbar's ambassadors. He describes some spring and Śrī Pañcamī festivities of Ḥusain Khān (lines 589-594), and then, in lines 595-6, he says that he had अण्णमा (आ)रदोष; and होसैनशाह शीतांशौ ग्रहोपस्मारराज्या । दुर्विचारान्धकारेभ्यो जनो भीत्याकुलोभवत् । *i.e.*, the Ḥusain Shāh Moon having been swallowed up by the *Rāhu* of epilepsy the people became frightened of the darkness of injustice. The next line describes, in somewhat curious language, that bestowing the kingdom on his brother the king Ḥusain went to paradise, which he had acquired by his bounty, as if incited by his curiosity. The next line says he was always happy in his reign, which extended to seven years.

<sup>2</sup> Firishtah lith. ed. has incorrectly دربذوقت محمد خان و بهت یوسف ولد. Col. Briggs makes no mention of Muḥammad Bhat or Yūsuf; he calls (vol. IV, p. 520) the place where "Ally Khan" was, "Shewpur." Rodgers (*J.A.S.B.*, vol. LIV, p. 132) translates Firishtah correctly, but "Bihut Yūsuf" is curious. The place of 'Alī Khān's residence is called Sonpūr.

<sup>3</sup> One MS. has Sūyyapūr, the other has Rasūlpūr. The lith. ed. is defective and omits a part of the sentence. Firishtah lith. ed. has Sonpūr.

In the end, 'Alī Khān advanced towards Srinagar, and encamped at a distance of seven *karōhs* from there. Malik Lūli Laund now fled, and went to 'Alī Khān. Husain Khān came out of the city, and went to <sup>1</sup>Jahlah Hājam, which was one *karōh* from it. Ahmad and Muhammad and Ankrī, who were his door-keepers and *amīrs*, fled that night and went to 'Alī Khān. <sup>2</sup>Daulat, who was one of his near relations said to Husain Khān, "As all men are running away from you, it would be better that you should send the emblems of royalty, about which there is always dispute, to 'Alī Khān. He is your brother, and is not a stranger." Husain Khān then sent the royal umbrella and the *yāk*-tales, and all other insignias of royalty to 'Alī Khān by the hand of his own son Yūsuf; and said, "My only offence was this that I became ill." After that 'Alī Khān came to Husain Khān's house, and enquired about his health; and they wept together.

<sup>3</sup> Then Husain Khān made over the city to 'Alī Khān; and he came to Zaīnpūr, and took up his residence there. 'Alī Khān assumed the title of 'Alī Shāh, and the duties of royalty devolved upon him; and <sup>4</sup>Dūkha, who was the *vakīl* of Husain Khān was put in charge of the public affairs. After three months Husain Khān departed from the world. 'Alī Khān went to meet his bier, and he was buried in the vicinity of *Hairān Bazār*.

<sup>1</sup> The name in one MS. is *حک حاحم* without any dots, in the other it is *حک حاحم* which is probably Hahadjājam. The lith. ed. has *حک حاحم*. Firishtah lith. ed. has *حک یاجم*. Col. Briggs does not mention the place. Rodgers calls it Jalahājam.

<sup>2</sup> There is no affix to the name in the MSS. or in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has Daulat Chak.

<sup>3</sup> Prājyabhaṭṭa is silent over all that happened prior to the transfer of the sovereignty; but line 600 reads *आलिखानादिवे राज्ये दुःखः ददलः अनाः । उदयादिवे सूर्ये ग्रानः कनलिनी यथा ।* i.e., the kingdom having devolved on 'Alī Khān, all the people were happy as in the morning the lotus (blooms) when the sun goes to the mountain of the dawn.

<sup>4</sup> The name appears to be Dūkha, though there are slight variations. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 522) calls it Dookna. Rodgers does not mention the name. Dūkha meaning "sorry", "poor" is quite a humble name; and the man was apparently of humble origin.

At this time Shāh 'Ārif *Darvīsh*, coming from Ḥusain <sup>1</sup> Qūlī Khān at Lāhōre arrived in Kashmīr. 'Alī Khān gave him his daughter in marriage; and believed him to be the *Mahdī* of the end of the world. 'Alī Chak, son of Naurōz Chak, and Ibrāhīm Khān, son of Ghāzī Khān, placing great faith in him, bowed in worship before him; and considering him to be fit (for such honour) decided to place him on the throne. When this news reached 'Alī Khān's ears, he became annoyed with him, and wanted to injure him. Shāh 'Ārif, coming to know of this, gave out, that he would not remain there, and that he would go to Lāhōre or some other country in the course of one day; and hid himself, so that people might believe that he had disappeared (by some occult power). After two or three days, it became known, that he had paid two *ashrafīs* to some boatmen, and embarking in their boat, had arrived at Bārāmūla, and from there had got into the mountains. Some men were sent, and he was brought from there, and was placed in the custody of guards. When he fled a second time, he was brought back from the mountain of Mehtar Sulaimān. This time 'Alī Khān took from him a thousand *ashrafīs* in exchange for the *mihr* of his daughter, and obtained *ṭalāq* (divorce) for her from him; and he was permitted to go away to Tibet; and the two eunuchs, that he had with him, were separated from him and kept under surveillance.

In the year 979 A.H., 'Alī Chak son of Naurōz Chak, came before 'Alī Khān and said, "Dūkha has come into my *jāgīr* and has created disturbance there. If you will not forbid him, I shall cut open the stomachs of my horses." 'Alī Khān understood that these words were a hint that he would cut open 'Alī Shāh's stomach. He became angry, and had him seized and sent to Kamrāj. He fled from there and went to Ḥusain Qūlī Khān, the governor of Lāhōre; but as at the interview he did not perform the ceremonies, which were customary, his going there was of no avail, and he fled from Lāhōre and returned to Kashmīr.

---

<sup>1</sup> The name is Ḥusain Qūlī Khān in one MS. and in the lith. ed. of *Firishtah*. In the other MS. it is Ḥusain Khān by mistake while it is Ḥusain Qūlī Khān in the lith. ed. of the *Ṭabaqāt*. *Firishtah* says he described himself as a descendant of Shāh Ṭahmāsp Ṣafvī, and was a *Shī'a*.

He was seized and brought to Srinagar, and was kept in prison. After some time he escaped, and fled to Nau Shahr. 'Alī Khān sent some troops against him, and he was again seized and brought before 'Alī Khān.

In the year 980, 'Alī Khān sent an army to invade Kahtwārah (Kishtwār); and, taking the daughter of the ruler of the country, made peace with the latter, and returned.

During this time Mullā 'Ishqī and Qāḍī Ṣadr-ud-dīn came as ambassadors from the threshold of His Majesty the Khālifa-i-Ilāhī. 'Alī Khān sent the daughter of his nephew for the service of the fortunate prince Sultān Salīm, with Mullā Ishqī and Qāḍī Ṣadr-ud-dīn, with other fine presents and tribute; and the public prayers and the coins of Kashmīr were adorned and embellished with the renowned name of His Majesty the Khālifa-i-Ilāhī. These events happened in the year 980 A.H.

At this time Yūsuf Shāh, son of 'Alī Khān, had Ibrāhīm Khān, son of Ghāzī Khān, executed on the accusation of Muḥammad Bhat, without obtaining the consent of his father; and for fear of the latter he and Muḥammad Bhat fled, and went to Bārāmūla. 'Alī Khān, on hearing this, was much pained in his mind. But men prayed for the pardon of Yūsuf's offence, and he was summoned; and Muḥammad Bhat, who was the cause of this disturbance, was imprisoned.

In the year 982 A.H., 'Alī Shāh sent an army to invade the country of Kahtwārah, which is also called Kishtwār; and taking the daughter of the ruler of that country (in marriage) for his grandson Ya'qūb made peace with him; and returned to the city.

In the year 983 A.H., 'Alī Khān went with his family and dependants to see Jamalnagarī. Haidar Khān, son of Muḥammad Shāh, one of the descendants of Sultān Zain-ul-'ābidīn, who had been in Gujrat, and when the servants of His Majesty went there, had waited upon him and had come to Hindūstān at his stirrups. From Hindūstān he had come to Nau Shahr. There was a cousin of his, Salīm Khān, there. A large body of men joined him (i.e., Haidar Khān). 'Alī Khān sent a large body of troops with Lōhar Chak to remain at Rājaurī. Muḥammad Khān Chak, who was at Rājaurī, was jealous of Lōhar Chak having been made the commander; he seized him and taking all the troops with him, went to Haidar Khān at Nau Shahr, and said to

him "Send <sup>1</sup> Islām Khān, who is a brave man, with me, so that I may go and conquer Kashmīr for you." Haīdar Khān being deceived by his words, sent Islām Khān with him. When they arrived in the village <sup>2</sup> of Jaukas, Muḥammad Khān, in the morning, treacherously slew Islām Khān, and returning from there came to Kashmīr and going to 'Alī Shāh became the recipient of favours from him. <sup>3</sup> 'Alī and Ankri and Dāūd Kadār and others, who had intended to help Haīdar Khān, were imprisoned.

In the year 984 A.H., there was <sup>4</sup> a great famine in Kashmīr, and many people died of the great hunger.

In the year <sup>5</sup> 986 A.H. (the Sultān) climbed to the top (platform in front ?) of the mosque, and joined in an assembly of learned and



pious men. Then bringing a book called the <sup>1</sup> *Mishkuāt* to that assembly, he, in accordance with a tradition which had come down in respect of the excellences of repentance, repented of his sins, and after making ablutions occupied himself with offering his prayers and reading the *Qurān*. After he had finished these, he mounted with the intention of playing *Chaugān* (polo); and going to the field of 'Īdgāh engaged in the game. Accidentally he was hit on the stomach by a wooden bow of his saddle; and died of that injury.

#### AN ACCOUNT OF YŪSUF KHĀN, SON OF 'ALI SHĀH.

When 'Ali Shāh passed away, his brother <sup>2</sup> Abdāl Khān did not, for fear of his nephew Yūsuf Khān accompany the funeral procession. Yūsuf sent <sup>3</sup> Saiyid Mubārak Khān, and Bābū Khālil to him with the message, "Come and bury your brother. If you accept me as the Sultān then it is all right, otherwise you be the ruler and I shall be <sup>4</sup> your subject." When they took Yūsuf Khān's message to Abdāl

<sup>1</sup> The word is مشكوات in the MSS., and مشكوة in the lith. ed. both of the *Ṭabaqāt* and of *Firishtah*. The correct name is مشكوة. It is a very popular collection of the Traditions by *Al-Khaṣīb-At-Ṭabrizī*, who was an eminent Traditionist, and who flourished in the first half of the 8th century Hijra. The work is an enlarged recension of an older book by *Al-Baghavi*, who died A.H. 516, A.D. 1142, entitled-*Maṣābil-As Sunna*. The full title is مشكوة المصابيح, *Mishkuāt-al-Maṣābil* (Niches for the lamps).

<sup>2</sup> According to *Prājyabhaṭṭa*, Abdāl Khān was enraged at Yūsuf's succeeding his father 'Ali Shāh. He claimed that the succession should pass to the brother. Lines 623-24 say, 'तस्मिन् प्रयाते विदिवं नरेन्द्रे राज्यं गृहीते च तदीयपुत्रे। अन्धाल्लखानोऽपि चकार कोपं पितृव्य एतस्य सहीष्टतोऽपि। यदापि विद्यते धाता धाता गृह्णाति तत्पद। इत्थं कुलक्रमोऽस्माकं कथं राज्यं स इच्छति। Then line 625 says there was a fight between Abdāl and Yūsuf, who is called योसोभगाद, at Sekandarapura, about which place I cannot find anything; and the former इत्वारिसैनिकं। कुतूहलेनैव दिवं ययौ धातुदिदृक्षया। (l. 626), i.e., after slaying the troops went to heaven as if with curiosity to see his brother.

Yūsuf Khān is said to have given away much treasure to blot out the memory of Karṇa, Māndhātā (line 627).

<sup>3</sup> *Firishtah* also has Saiyid Mubārak Khān and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 525). Syud Moobarik Khan, but Rodgers (*J.A.S.B.*, vol. LIV, p. 135) has Sayyid Mubārīz Khān.

<sup>4</sup> One MS. omits the word شما. The other has تدیع instead of تابع. *Firishtah* lith. ed. is more explicit, and has من تابع شما خواهم بود.

Khān, the latter said, "I am coming relying on your words, and I am girding up my loins in your service. If I receive any injury that will be on your shoulders" (i.e., you will be responsible for it). Saiyid Mubārak, who was on bad terms with Abdāl, said, "We have also to go to Yūsuf, and take promises and engagements from him." With this agreement, the meeting broke up. When (Saiyid Mubārak) went to Yūsuf, he said to him, "Abdāl Khān did not come in compliance with your words." Abdāl Bhat said, "We should go very quickly, and attack him; and then we could bury 'Alī Shāh." Yūsuf Khān mounted at once and marched and attacked him (Abdāl Khān). The latter came, and met him, and was slain. Ḥasan Khān, son of Saiyid Mubārak Khān was also slain in the skirmish. The next day he buried 'Alī Shāh, and Yūsuf became the ruler in the place of his father.

After two months, <sup>1</sup>Saiyid Mubārak Khān and 'Alī Khān and others crossed the river with the intention of creating a revolt. Yūsuf Khān advanced against them in concert with <sup>2</sup>Muhammad Khān, the murderer of Salīm Khān, and Muhammad Khān, who was the commander of the vanguard, taking time by the forelock, came and confronted the enemy with sixty men, but was slain. <sup>3</sup>Yūsuf asked

<sup>1</sup> See line 628 of Prājyabhaṭṭa which says सोमारखानोजदूरं युद्धचिकीर्षया, i.e., Mubārak Khān went away to a distance, wishing to fight (with Yūsuf); and line 629 says Muhammad Khān, Yūsuf's servant fought with Mubārak Khān in the neighbourhood of Diddā Maṭha, which according to Stein's *Rājataranginī*, vol. II, page 448, is now the large quarter of Didamar, which forms the western end of the city of Śrīnagar on the right river bank. The Maṭha was built by queen Diddā for the accommodation of travellers from various parts of India. The fact of Muhammad Khān being slain is mentioned in line 631.

<sup>2</sup> See page 750 where he was described as Muhammad Khān Chak. Firishtah lith. ed. has a different reading. It says يوسف شاه اتفاق محمد ماکری که هر اول او بود. The correctness of the Ṭabaqāt is proved by Prājyabhaṭṭa (l. 629). See the preceding note.

<sup>3</sup> Prājyabhaṭṭa (l. 633) says, Yūsuf after enjoying the pleasures of rule for two and half months, जगत् खण्डलोकानां मार्गं पर्वतदुर्गमं i.e., he went to the inaccessible mountains, the country of the Khaṣas. These, it may be said parenthetically, belonged to a tribe, which is mentioned in the *Bṛhat-Saṃhitā* of Varāhamihira (ca. 500 A.D.), and they have been identified with the

for quarter, and came to Hīrahpūr; and <sup>1</sup> Saiyid Mubārak Khān sat on the seat of authority.

After some time Muḥammad Yūsuf Khān, acting on letters sent to him by (some) Kashmīris, made an attempt on Kashmīr. Saiyid Mubārak Khān on hearing this news arrayed his troops and started to fight with him. Yūsuf Khān was again unable to withstand him, and went to the village of <sup>2</sup> Barsāl, which is situated in the jungle. Saiyid Mubārak Khān hastened in pursuit of him, and a battle took place. Yūsuf Khān fled to the mountains round about; and Saiyid Mubārak Khān came to Kashmīr with victory and triumph. He deceitfully summoned 'Alī Khān, son of Naurōz, and imprisoned him. The other Chaks, such as Lōhar Chak, Haidar Chak and Hastī Chak did not come to him through fear. (Saiyid Mubārak Khān) sent Bābā Khalīl and Saiyid Barkhūrdār to them, and summoned them after making conditions and engagements. They all came to him, and having obtained his permission, went away to their respective places.

On the way <sup>3</sup> they settled among themselves, that Yūsuf should be sent for, and placed on the throne. They sent a messenger to Yūsuf Khān from the place where they were. Saiyid Mubārak Khān on hearing this was dismayed, and sent <sup>4</sup> Muḥammad Khān Mākṣī to Yūsuf, so that he might tell the latter, that he (Saiyid Mubārak

present Khaka tribe, to which most of the petty chiefs in the *Vitastā* valley below Kashmīr and in the neighbouring hills belong.

<sup>1</sup> The usurpation of Saiyid Mubārak Khān does not appear to be mentioned in so many words by Firishtah; but it is mentioned by Prājyabhaṭṭa, line 634, and by the Cambridge History of India, page 292.

<sup>2</sup> The name is Barsāl in the MS., and Barmāl in the lith. ed. of the *Ṭabaqāt*, and Parthāl in that of Firishtah. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 525) has Hurunpal Nursak, and Rodgers (*J.A.S.B.*, vol. LIV, p. 136) has Parthāl. Prājyabhaṭṭa does not mention the place, but proceeds at once to mention Yūsuf's going to Akbar, who is called चमस्तदयिवीपालचञ्जालदीनभूपति । (l. 635).

<sup>3</sup> Prājyabhaṭṭa in lines 636, 637 says that gradually the people became hostile to Mubārak Khān, and he died (उत्तम देवतागारे) after having enjoyed happiness for one and a quarter month (चपादस्यैव मासस्य सुखं कृत्वा).

<sup>4</sup> The name is as I have it in the text in one MS. and in the lith. ed. In the other MS. it looks like Muḥammad Khān Kasi, and this has been followed in the text-edition. The name is not mentioned in Firishtah or elsewhere.

Khān) would accept him as the Sultān, and was repentant of what he had done. Muḥammad Khān on leaving him joined his enemies. Saiyid Mubārak Khān became still more distressed, and determined that he would go with his sons and slaves to Yūsuf Khān, and with this determination left the city and went to the 'Īdgāh. He took 'Alī Khān, the son of Naurōz Bhat, whom he had imprisoned, with him. Daulat Khān, who was one of his *amīrs* fled from him. He in greater confusion released 'Alī Khān from confinement, and went alone to the *Khānqāh* of Bābā Khālil. <sup>1</sup> Haidar Chak said to 'Alī Khān, "All our exertions and endeavours were for your release." Yūsuf, son of 'Alī Khān, said to his father, "Haidar Chak wants to act treacherously towards you"; but 'Alī Khān refused to believe him and started in company with Haidar Chak. Lōhar Chak and others like him had assembled together. When 'Alī Khān came, they seized and imprisoned him; and <sup>2</sup> decided among themselves that they would place Lōhar Chak on the throne.

At this time Yūsuf Khān arrived at <sup>3</sup> Kākpūr; and he then learned, that the Kashmīrīs had decided to place Lōhar on the throne. He came from there to the village of <sup>4</sup> Dhail, and taking all his men

---

<sup>1</sup> Prājyabhaṭṭa (l. 638) says that Haidar Chak and his companions defeated Mubārak Khān, and installed Lōhar Chak as the ruler of the country सोमारखानं निर्जित्य चक्रेदरकादयः । राज्ये निवेशयामासुः त्रैमल्लकरचक्रकं । It goes on to say that during Lōhar Chak's reign, there was great loss of life caused by lions. I mention this as a curious fact, for what it is worth, but I cannot find any mention of lions in Kashmīr anywhere else; तस्मिन्मल्लकरभूपाले भूमिं शासति सर्व्वतः । बभूवोपद्रवो नित्यं सिंहेभ्यो घामवासिनां । रात्रौ यो यः प्रतिघामं गृहद्वाराद्विनिर्गतः । निहतः स स सिंहेन पिशाचेनैव भक्षता । (lines 639, 640).

<sup>2</sup> One MS. omits by mistake the words from قرار دادند to که لومر را. In the text-edition it is لومر only instead of لومر چک as in the translation.

<sup>3</sup> The name is कालपुर in one MS. In the other the clause in which the name occurs is omitted in the preceding note. The lith. ed. has का कपुर, while the lith. ed. of Firishtah has कालपुर, and this name is used by Rodgers (*J.A.S.B.*, vol. LIV, p. 136). I cannot find anything about Kākpūr or Kālpūr but there is a village of the name of Kākapūr, which forms as it were a riverside station or port of Śūpiyan on the *Pitastā* (see Stein's *Rājataranginī*, vol. I, p. 183, footnote 695 and vol. II, p. 474).

<sup>4</sup> The name is ذیل and زیل in the MS., and ریل in the lith. ed. of the *Tabaqāt*, and زاهل in that of Firishtah. Col. Briggs does not give the name

with him, went to Saiyid Yūsuf Khān Lāhōrī by way of Jammū. He then went to Fathpūr with Saiyid Yūsuf Khān, and Rāja Mān Singh; and was honoured by being allowed to wait upon His Majesty the <sup>1</sup> Khālifa-i-Ilāhī. From there <sup>2</sup> he sent his Ya'qūb to Kashmīr. The government of Kashmīr was confirmed on Lōhar.

In the year 987 A.H., Muḥammad Yūsuf Khān started with Saiyid Yūsuf Khān and Rāja Mān Singh from Fathpur to conquer Kashmīr. When they arrived at Siūlkōt, he <sup>3</sup> without taking their help went to Rājaurī, and took possession of it; and he then arrived at the station of <sup>4</sup> Thatha. At this time Lōhar sent Yūsuf Kashmīrī to fight with Yūsuf Khān; and Yūsuf Kashmīrī, after leaving Lōhār's presence went to Yūsuf Khān and joined him. Yūsuf Khān then went by way of <sup>5</sup> Jhavail, which was the most difficult route, and

but Rodgers (*J.A.S.B.*, vol. LIV, p. 136) calls it Zūhil. I cannot find anything about any of these places. ذابل in the text-edition.

<sup>1</sup> Both MSS. have خالنت پنہائی, but the lith. ed. has حضرت خلیفہ الہی ملازمت جلال الدین محمد اکبر بادشاہ. I have retained the reading in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has

<sup>2</sup> Firishtah explains that Ya'qūb was sent ahead, so that he might gain the people over to his father's side, and create disturbances in Lōhar Chak's government.

<sup>3</sup> One MS. and the lith. eds. of the Ṭabaqat and of Firishtah have بمدد ایشان, but the other MS. has by mistake مقید شدہ.

<sup>4</sup> One MS. has بمومل تہتہ, the other has بمنزل تہہ. The lith. ed. has بمنزل تہتہ, and that of Firishtah has بمنزل تہتہ. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 526) has Lassa, and Rodgers (*J.A.S.B.*, vol. LIV, p. 137) has Thatta; but neither of them explains why or how he went to these distant places. Prājyabhatṭa (l. 642) says श्रीमत्सुख्यपुरासं वितस्ताजलदुर्गसं । शिथिये स मञ्जीपाल उद्याद्रिमिवांशुमान् । This is definite: he took shelter in Svayyapura, which was inaccessible on account of being surrounded by the waters of the Vitastā. If Svayyapura be identical with Suyyapūr, the modern Sōpūr, it was situated a short distance below the point where the Vitastā leaves the Volur. It is, however, very difficult to identify Svayyapura with Thatha or any other name like it.

<sup>5</sup> The name is جہول in both MSS. and جہوتل in the lith. ed. In Firishtah lith. ed. it looks like جہول or جہول. I cannot find anything about this place; but the correct name appears to be Jhavail. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 526) has Jeshbul; and Rodgers (*J.A.S.B.*, vol. LIV, p. 137) has Jhūpul.

marched rapidly and entered the fort of <sup>1</sup>Sūyyapūr. Lōhar came in concert with Haidar Chak, <sup>2</sup>Shams Chak and Hasti Chak and confronted Yūsuf Khān. The armies encamped on the bank of the river Bihat (*i.e.*, the Jhelum). After some days <sup>3</sup>there was a great battle. From the auspiciousness of the attention of His Majesty the Khālifa-i-Ilāhī, the victory fell to Yūsuf Khān.

After the victory, (Yūsuf Khān) marched to Srinagar, and entered it. Lōhar came, through the intervention of Qādī Mūsā and Muḥammad Bhat, and saw <sup>4</sup>Yūsuf Khān. In the first meeting, the interview was satisfactory; but in the end Lōhar was put into prison. A large number of the rebels were also cast into prison. When Yūsuf Khān's mind was set at rest in respect of his enemies, he divided the country of Kashmīr. He separated good *jāgīrs* for <sup>5</sup>Shams Chak, son of Daulat Chak, and Ya'qūb Chak, and Yūsuf Kashmīrī, and made all the rest his own *Khālṣa*. On the accusation of some Kashmīrīs he had the blinding needle drawn across Lōhar's eyes.

In the year 988 A.H., Yūsuf imprisoned <sup>6</sup>Shams Chak and 'Alī Shēr and Muḥammad Khān, on the suspicion that they were about to

<sup>1</sup> The name is سوبه پور in one MS. In the other it is سوند, and in the lith. ed. it is سوبه. Firishtah lith. ed. has سونپور Sōnpur. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 526) has Showpoor and Rodgers (*J.A.S.B.*, vol. LIV, p. 137) Sonpūr. I think Sūyyapūr is the correct name. See note 4, page 756.

<sup>2</sup> The name is Shams Chak in one MS. and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah; it is Shamsī Chak in the other MS. and in the lith. ed. of the Ṭabaqāt.

<sup>3</sup> The battle is mentioned by Prājyabhaṭṭa (lines 645, 646), who says  
जाल्वा योसोभभूपालस्तत्तद्रिपुविचेष्टितं । वितस्ताजलमुल्लङ्घ्य युयुधे लङ्करेण सः । विधाय  
तमुलं युद्धं सर्व्वप्राणिभयावहं । मन्त्री लङ्करखानस्य समाराब्दालनेरकः ।

<sup>4</sup> This is also mentioned by Prājyabhaṭṭa (l. 648) लङ्करखानो योसोभखान-  
पादमश्रियत् । सधातरममुं सोऽपि निर्नेचमकरोत् क्षणात् ।

<sup>5</sup> There are some differences in the names. In one MS. Ya'qūb Chak is written as Ya'qūb Bēg. In the other Shams Chak, son of Daulat Chak, is converted to Shams Chak and Daulat Chak. Ya'qūb Chak appears, according to Firishtah, to be Yūsuf's son.

<sup>6</sup> The names are as I have them in the text in the MSS. as well as in the lith. ed. of the Ṭabaqāt. Firishtah lith. ed., however, has the suffix of Chak to the name of 'Alī Shēr, and calls the third man Muḥammad Sa'ūdāt Bhat. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 527) calls the second man Ally Chuk and the third Mahomed Khan; while Rodgers (*J.A.S.B.*, vol. LIV, p. 137) transforms the third name to Muhammad Saūdāt Bihut.

rebel against him. Ḥabīb Khān fled for fear and went to the village of <sup>1</sup>Kasr. Yūsuf, son of 'Alī Khān, who had been imprisoned by Yūsuf Khān, effected his release, and with his four brothers joined Ḥabīb Khān in the above-named village. From there they all went to <sup>2</sup>Ran Mal the Rāja of Tibet, and came back after obtaining reinforcements from him. When they arrived near the frontier of Kashmīr, they, owing to the differences which developed among them, were unable to do anything, and parted from one another without doing anything. Yūsuf and Muḥammad Khān were seized, and brought before Yūsuf Khān; and their ears and noses were cut off. Ḥabīb Khān concealed himself in the city.

In the year 989 A.H., His Majesty the Khalīfa-i-Ilāhī, returning from the conquest of Kābul, made his grand encampment in Jalālābād. He sent <sup>3</sup>Mirzā Ṭāhir, a relation of Mirzā Yūsuf Khān, and Muḥammad Ṣāliḥ 'Āqil as ambassadors to Kāshmir. When they arrived at Bārāmūla, Yūsuf Khān hastened to welcome them, and taking the (imperial) *farmān* in his hand showed reverence for it. He came into Srinagar with the ambassadors and sent his son Ḥaidar Khān, with many rich presents to wait on His Majesty. Ḥaidar Khān remained in attendance for a period of one year, and then he, and Shaikh Ya'qūb Kashmīrī obtained leave to return to Kashmīr.

In the year 989 A.H., Yūsuf Khān went on a visit to Lār and Shams Chak fled from the prison and went to <sup>4</sup>Kahwār; and joined <sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The name looks like كسر Kasr in both MSS. It is Kashūr in the lith. ed. of the Ṭabaqāt; while Firishtah lith. ed. has كهنیز. The text-edition following Firishtah has كهنیز. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 527) has Gabeer and Rodgers (*J.A.S.B.*, vol. LIV, p. 137) has to the town of Khū. I cannot find any place in Kashmīr which resembles any of these names.

<sup>2</sup> The name is رونمل in both MSS., and رنمل in the lith. ed. of the Ṭabaqāt. The name is not quite distinct in the lith. ed. of Firishtah, and both Col. Briggs and Rodgers omit it. I think Ran Mal (Sanskrit Ranamalla) is better and I have adopted it. In the text-edition it is رومل.

<sup>3</sup> According to Firishtah Mirzā Ṭāhir was a relation of Mirzā Saiyid Khān Shahīdī.

<sup>4</sup> The name is written as کنوار and کموار, but it is the same as Kishtwār or Khatwārah. See note 3, page 758.

<sup>5</sup> This is apparently referred to by Prājyabhaṭṭa (lines 649, 650) where, however, it is said that Ḥaidar Chak took shelter in आकल देम and there was a battle between him and Yūsuf.

Ḥaidar Chak who was there. Yūsuf receiving information of this event sent an army to attack them. They separated and fled; and Yūsuf Khān returned victorious and triumphant towards Srinagar.

In the year 990 A.H., Ḥaidar Chak and Shams Chak advanced towards Kashmīr from Kahwār in order to fight with Yūsuf Khān. The latter advanced to meet them; and made his son Ya qūb the commander of the vanguard. He was victorious in the battle, and returned to Srinagar. He, at the intervention of the Rāy of Kahwār, pardoned Shams Chak's offence, and granted him a *jāgīr*. <sup>1</sup> Ḥaidar Chak came out of the place where he was, and went to Rāja Mān Singh.

<sup>2</sup> In the year 992 A.H., Ya'qūb, son of Yūsuf Chak, was exalted by having the honour of kissing the threshold of His Majesty the Khālifa-i-Ilāhī. When the latter arrived in Lāhōre with grandeur and good fortune, Ya'qūb wrote to Yūsuf, that His Majesty intended to go to Kashmīr. Yūsuf Khān determined that he should advance to welcome him. At this time information reached him, that Ḥakīm 'Alī and <sup>3</sup> Bahā'-ud-dīn having come as ambassadors from the servants of His Majesty had arrived at <sup>4</sup> Thatha. Yūsuf Khān advanced to welcome them, and putting on the robes conferred on him by the emperor made repeated obeisances; and with a firm determination wished to present himself at the threshold. <sup>5</sup> Bābā Khālīl

<sup>1</sup> This is referred to in line 651, which says, व्यञ्जालदीनभूपत्य ययौ हैदर-चककः । सकाशं वस्तुभिर्दीनो भास्करस्येव चन्द्रमाः ।

<sup>2</sup> Compare Prājyabhaṭṭa (l. 659) व्यञ्जालदीनभूपालसेवनार्थं कृतोद्यमः । याकोभराजपुत्रोऽपि प्रहितसेन मृतः ।

<sup>3</sup> One MS. has Bahā'-ud-dīn Kambū, but the other MS. and the lith. ed. do not have Kambu after Bahā'-ud-dīn. Firishtah lith. ed. omits the name of Bahā'-ud-dīn altogether, and mentions Ḥakīm 'Alī Gīlānī as the only ambassador.

<sup>4</sup> See note 4, page 756. *Thatha* is the name of the place in the text-edition.

<sup>5</sup> Prājyabhaṭṭa (line 658 and the following lines) gives a different reason for the final breach of the friendly relations between Akbar and Yūsuf. It says that the prince Yaqūb was sent by Yūsuf to render service to Akbar, व्यञ्जालदीनभूपालसेवनार्थं. Akbar on seeing the rich presents placed before him by Ya'qūb became anxious to conquer Kashmīr, कश्मीरविजयोत्कण्ठा सम्बभूव महीश्वरः । He accordingly gave orders to Bhagwān Dās and other commanders, (कृताज्ञा भगवदासप्रमुखानां महीश्वरतां). Coming to know of this, Ya'qūb left Akbar's



and Bābū Mahdī and <sup>1</sup>Shams Dūbī <sup>2</sup>being perplexed about him kept him back from carrying out his determination; and resolved that if Yūsuf Khān went towards the threshold, they would put him to death; and would raise his son Ya'qūb in his place. For fear of this, (Yūsuf) postponed the carrying out of his intention; and gave leave to the imperial ambassadors to return.

The servants of His Majesty then appointed Mīrzā Shāh Rukh and Shāh Qulī Khān and Rājā Bhagwān Dās to invade Kashmir. Yūsuf Khān came out of Kashmir (Srinagar), and encamped with his army at Bārāmūla. When news came that the victorious army had arrived at <sup>3</sup>Bhimbar, <sup>4</sup>Yūsuf Khān (separating himself) from the

service, and came secretly to Kashmir, त्यक्त्वा भूपालसेवनं । प्रत्याययौ स्वकग्रीर-  
देशं मार्गादलक्षितः. He came and informed his father, and pointed out that the  
greatness of the great who are weak is of no avail (महतोऽप्यसमर्थस्य महत्त्वं याति  
निष्फलं । पर्वतसदृशकारं कुञ्जरं दन्ति केशरी). Then they all set out for war; but  
after this there was a long controversy between Yūsuf Khān, who argued that it  
was not within their capacity to withstand Akbar's power, and his ministers who  
advised war. They even said, भवन्तः सन्तु दूरस्थाः कुर्मस्वत्कार्यनिर्णयं । जाद्वलं  
देशमाश्रित्य धोत्स्यामः प्रत्यहं वयं (l. 677), i.e., you remain at a distance; we will  
decide your work; we will take shelter in the forest, and carry on daily  
skirmishes; but their arguments were of no avail; and he went to Rājā Bhagwān  
Dās, इति निश्चित्य भूपालो ज्योत्सलदीनभूपतेः । चरणं शरणीकृतुं भगवद्दामाययत् ।  
(l. 691). Then Ya'qūb ascended the throne, and he pleased the people by  
distributing the treasures collected by his father; but as usual, in the later history  
of Kashmir, there were mutual jealousy and quarrels. After that Akbar sent  
Qāsim Khān to conquer Kashmir. कासिमखाननामानं चक्रद्वैदरसेवितं । प्रेरयामास  
भूपालः कश्मीरविजयेच्छया । (l. 705).

<sup>1</sup> The name is Shams Dūbī in the lith. eds. of the Ṭabaqāt and of Firishtah; but the suffix is doubtful in the MSS., it is Dūnī in one and Dūli in the other. Col. Briggs omits the name, but Rodgers (*J.A.S.B.*, vol. LIV, p. 138) calls the man Shams Dadli. شمس دونی in the text-edition.

<sup>2</sup> The word is موس in both MSS. and the lith., ed. and موسوس in the text-edition.

<sup>3</sup> There are differences in the readings. The MSS. have به پرم and بهنیر; and the lith. ed. has به بهنر. Firishtah lith. ed. has بهو لباس که سرحد. کشمیراست. The text-edition following the MSS. has adopted پرم.

<sup>4</sup> The sentence appears to me to be confused and incomplete. I have thought it necessary to insert the words جدا شدہ to complete the sentence.

army took up his station in the village of Nagar, with the intention of loyally serving His Majesty the *Khalīfa-i-Ilāhī* in concert with *Mirzā Qāsim*, son of *Khawājah Hājī*, and *Mahdī Kōkah* and *Ustād Laṭīf*. *Mādhō Singh* came to the above-mentioned village in order to receive *Yūsuf Khān*; and took him with himself to *Rāja Bhagwān Dās*. The latter sent him a horse and a <sup>1</sup> *Siropā* after the meeting; and marching from there advanced towards *Kashmīr* (*Srinagar*). The *Kashmīrīs* received him peacefully, and agreed that they would send every year a fixed sum for the imperial treasury. <sup>2</sup> *Rāja Bhagwān Dās* returned from there after concluding the peace; and obtained the honour of kissing the dust of the threshold at *Atak*. *Yūsuf Khān* also came with him, and obtained the distinction of kissing the threshold, which is the semblance of paradise.

## SECTION X. <sup>3</sup>THE SECTION ABOUT THE RULERS OF SIND.

It is narrated in the history of *Minhāj-ul-Masālik*, which is known as the *Chach-nāma*, that when the turn of the *Khilāfat* came to *Walid*, the son of 'Abd-ul-malik, the son of *Marwān*, <sup>4</sup> *Hajjāj*, the son of *Yūsuf*, sent *Muḥammad Hārūn* towards India, and he advanced into the country of <sup>5</sup> *Mekrān*, in the early part of the year 86 A.H.; and commenced collecting revenue there. At this time news became

<sup>1</sup> See note 2, page 722.

<sup>2</sup> The history of *Kashmīr*, after the treaty concluded by *Rāja Bhagwān Dās* and which *Akbar* refused to ratify, will be found in the history of *Akbar's* reign in this volume. The *Cambridge History of India*, page 293, gives a summary.

<sup>3</sup> The heading in both MSS. is as I have it in the text. The lith. ed. has ذکر طبقہ سلاطین سندہ.

<sup>4</sup> He is described in *Muir's Annals of the Early Caliphate* (1883, p. 445) as "At this period (A.H. 71) the right arm of the Umayyad Caliphs" and who afterwards for twenty years was *Walid's* Viceroy in the eastern provinces of the Caliphate.

<sup>5</sup> "The ancient *Gedrosia*, that torrid region, extending in land from the northern shore of the sea of 'Omān" (*Cambridge History of India*, p. 1). I think it would have been much simpler, and more intelligible to call it by its modern name of *Balūchistān*.

current, in the capital city of Baghḍād that Malik <sup>1</sup> Sarandīp (who I suppose was the governor of Ceylon, but who is also called the king of Ceylon) had sent by sea a ship filled with rich and beautiful articles and male and female *Habshī* slaves for the servants of the capital. When the Shaikh arrived in the neighbourhood of <sup>2</sup> Dēbul,

<sup>1</sup> Sarandīp is usually identified with Ceylon, but Raverty (*J.A.S.B.*, vol. LXI, pt. i, p. 325) calls it Saran-Dīp and identifies it with Kachchh Bhuḡ.

<sup>2</sup> Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 403) says that Deebul is identical with "Modern Tutta on the Indus." The Cambridge History of India (p. 2) has Debul "Dāhir's principal seaport," and says further on that it was "about twenty-four miles to the south-west of the modern town of Tatta." ديبُل in the text-edition.

The exact position of Dēbul (though the correct transliteration of ديبُل which appears to be the form of the name in Persian would be Dabil) is as doubtful as the correct pronunciation of the name. There is a very long note, No. 316, in Major Raverty's paper in "*The Mīhrān of Sind and its Tributaries*" (*J.A.S.B.*, vol. LXI, pt. i, 1893) which extends from page 317 to page 331, in which he says all that could be said about Debal, and perhaps a good deal more, if I may say so, and in the course of which he says (p. 324), "Having clearly shown that Debal or Dewal was not Ṭṇaṭṇah, nor 'Bambura', nor Lāhrī Bandar, nor Karāghī, and stated that the latter was not founded for centuries after the 'Arab conquest, I will now show, as near as possible, where it was." The note goes on for pages, and although Debul is occasionally mentioned, as on page 326, where Sulṭān Mu'izz-ud-Dīn Muḥammad-i-Sām is said to have marched against it in 578 A.H. (1182-83 A.D.), and again on the same page where Sinān-ud-Dīn Ḥanīsar of Debal is mentioned as one of the seven petty *Rānās* in Sind, when Malik Nāṣir-ud-Dīn Kaḇā-jah declared his independence and assumed the title of Sulṭān, I cannot find any indication of the exact situation of the place.

Earlier in the note (pp. 319-321), however, Raverty gives some information about Debal from the accounts of the early English travellers. One of the earliest of these, Walter Paynton, who accompanied Captain Christopher Newport in 1612 says (p. 320) that, "Boats were sent from Diul (Dewal) for conveying the Ambassadors goods and people.....Tata a great Citie one dayes journey from Diul, both cities standing in the Great *Mogolls* Dominions." Subsequent to this W. Paynton, then Captain Paynton (p. 321) mentions "Diul near the mouth of the river *Indus*." He then mentions the account of Diul in the narrative of Sir Thomas Roe's embassy in 1615 and of Thevenot in 1665-66, and comes to the conclusion that "Debal or Dewal is said to have been in 1666, southernmost town of Sind; and its position is plainly stated in the account of Captain Newport's landing ..... The distance given as fifteen miles from

the turbulent people of that place looted that ship and seven other ships, and took possession of all the property in them. They also seized, with the object of making them slaves, a number of Musalmān women, who had embarked in the ship, with the object of circum-ambulating the *Ka'ba*. When these things were happening, a number of men fled and going to Ḥajjāj complained to him. Ḥajjāj, the son of Yūsuf, wrote a letter to <sup>1</sup> Rāy Dāhir, who was <sup>2</sup> the ruler of Hind and Sind, and sent it to Muḥammad Hārūn, so that he might send it by the hand of some of his trusted servants to Rāy Dāhir. When Muḥammad Hārūn sent the letter to him, he wrote in reply that the act had been committed by robbers (pirates); and their power and pomp were so great that they could not be destroyed by his exertions and endeavours.

When this reply reached Ḥajjāj, he solicited permission for the invasion of Sind and Hind from Walīd, the son of 'Abd-ul-malik,

Ṭhaṭṭah by the river, would bring us very near to the Shrine of Pīr Patho, at the foot of the Makkahli hills, and near the Bḥāgar branch of the Indus" (p. 322). Debal, he, therefore, concludes, lay "in the vicinity of that Shrine, but a little further the south-westward perhaps."

There are three maps in this paper, one without a date has Debal a little to the north of what is marked as Pīr Patho and about twenty-four miles to the west and a little to the south of Tatta, a second which is said to be from Purchas about 1615 A.D., which places Diul some distance almost due south, but a little to the west on the same bank of what appears to be the main estuary of the Indus, and a third, which is described as an old map published about the year 1700, which places Dobil or Dioul on the coast some distance to the south-west of Thata.

<sup>1</sup> Rāy Dāhir, according to the old Arab historians, was the son of Chach, the Brahman minister of the Rāy dynasty founded by the white Huns who settled in Sind, whose throne he then usurped, and became the ruler of the country. He had his capital at Alor. The *Chach-nāma*, extracts from the translation of which are given in H. M. Elliot's *History of India* (vol. I, pp. 140-152), contains a long account of Chach the father of Dāhir. It is said in the preface to the translation of the extracts from the *Chach-nāma* (p. 137) that Nizam-ud-dīn Ahmad, Nūru-l-Hakk, Firishta and Mīr Ma'sūm and others have drawn their account of the conquest of Sind from it.

<sup>2</sup> One MS. has والى سند omitting the words و بعد after it; and the other has والى سند و هند. I have adopted the reading of the second MS. In the text-edition it is only والى سند as in the first MS.

the <sup>1</sup> son of Marwān; and sent <sup>2</sup> Badīl with three hundred warriors to Muḥammad Hārūn, and wrote to him, that he should send three thousand great warriors (*mard jangjuī khūnrēz*) with him for the capture of Dēbul. When Badīl arrived in the neighbourhood of Dēbul, he after making great exertions, attained the good fortune of martyrdom. The heart of Ḥajjāj was distressed on hearing of this defeat and became very sad and sorrowful. Although 'Āmir, son of 'Abd-ul-lah, had intended to take the command of the army for the invasion of Sind. Ḥajjāj in consultation with astrologers, who knew the niceties of their science, prevented <sup>3</sup> 'Imād-ud-dīn Muḥammad Qāsim, son of 'Aqīl Ṭhaqfī, who was the son of his uncle and also his son-in-law, and was in his seventeenth year, and sent him with <sup>4</sup> six thousand men chosen from the chief men of Syria for the conquest of Sind by way of Shīrāz.

<sup>1</sup> One MS. omits *بن مروان*, while the other has *مروان* but omits *بن*. In the text-edition, however, as in the translation, the words *بن مروان* or the son of Marwān have been included.

<sup>2</sup> He is called Badīl in the MSS. of the Ṭabaqāt and the lith. eds. of the Ṭabaqāt and of Firishtah. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 403) calls him Budmeen. Al Bilāduri (*vide* Elliot, vol. I, p. 119) says there were two expeditions, one under 'Ubaidu-llah and the second under Budail son of Tahfa, both of which were unsuccessful and both the commanders were slain.

<sup>3</sup> The Cambridge History of India, page 2, insists on calling him Muhammad, and says that he should not be called Qāsim or Muhammad Qāsim, as he is sometimes called by European historians and directs that "this vulgar error, arising from a Persian idiom in which the word 'son' is understood, but not expressed, should be avoided." It appears, however, that this error is shared by Musalmān historians. Both Nizām-ud-dīn and Firishtah call him Muḥammad Qāsim, and as to the word 'son' being understood, it would appear that he was the son *not* of Qāsim but of 'Aqīl Ṭhaqfī. It must be noted, however, that Raverty (*J.A.S.B.*, vol. LXI, pt. i, p. 324) also calls him "Muḥammad, son of Kāsim." According to Al Bilāduri (Elliot, vol. I, p. 119) his full name was Muḥammad, son of Kāsim, son of Muḥammad, son of Hakim, son of Abū 'Ukail.

<sup>4</sup> Al Bilāduri (Elliot, vol. I, p. 119) says, "Hajjaj ordered six thousand Syrian warriors to attend Muhammad, and others besides. He was provided with all he could require, without omitting even thread and needle." According to the Cambridge History of India (p. 2), there were besides the six thousand Syrian horses, a camel corps of equal strength, and a baggage train of three thousand camels.

After traversing the stages and reaching the end of their journey they laid siege to the fort of Dēbul, and after a few days captured it, and an immense quantity of plunder fell into their hands. Among those there were four hundred slave girls of matchless beauty. Muḥammad Qāsim divided the booty among his soldiers, and sent the daughter of the Rāy of Dēbul, with a fifth part of the booty to Ḥajjāj. The <sup>1</sup> daughter of the Rāja of Dēbul fled and went to Jay Sinha, son of Rāy Dāhir, who was the governor of the fort of <sup>2</sup> Nīrūn. Muḥammad Qāsim advanced with a stout heart against him. Rāyzāda <sup>3</sup> Jay Sinha having placed the bridle of bravery and manliness in the hand of shamelessness, and making over the defence of the fort of Nīrūn to some trusted men crossed the <sup>4</sup> Mehrān river and went to the ancient fort of <sup>5</sup> Brahman-ābād. When Muḥammad

<sup>1</sup> Firishtah does not agree with the Ṭabaqāt in saying that the princess was sent to Ḥajjāj. He says that seventy-five slave girls with the fifth part of the booty were sent to Ḥajjāj.

<sup>2</sup> According to Ibn Ḥaukal quoted by Raverty (*J.A.S.B.*, vol. LXI, pt. i. 1893. p. 215) "Nīrūn is a city situated between Debal and Mansūriyah on the road thither, and is situated on the west side of the Mīhrān." According to Al Bilāduri (Elliot, vol. I, p. 121) the inhabitants of Nīrūn had, already before the arrival of Muhammad, sent two *Samanīs* or priests to Ḥajjāj to treat for peace; and on Muhammad's arrival they furnished him with supplies and admitted him into the town, and they were allowed to capitulate. The Cambridge History of India (p. 3) says that Nīrūn was about seventy-five miles to the north-east of Debul and near the modern Haidarābād (Hydrābād). *نیرون* in the text-edition is apparently a misprint for *نیرون*.

<sup>3</sup> The name looks like *جيسيه* Jaissiah in one MS. and *حبشه* Ḥabshah in the other and *حبيبه* Ḥaissiah in the lith. ed. Firishtah calls him son of Dāhir Fauji. The Cambridge History of India (p. 3) calls him Jai Singh. Raverty (*J.A.S.B.*, vol. LXI, pt. i. p. 232) has Jai Sinha.

<sup>4</sup> "The Sindhu, Nahr-i-Sind, Āb-i-Sind or Indus, from the time that we possess any authentic records respecting it, was a tributary along with the other rivers now forming the Panj Nad or the Panj Āb, of the Hakra or Wahindah, which having all united into one great river at the *Dugh-i-Āb* (literally meeting of water or waters-meet) as related by the old 'Arab and Sindī writers, formed the Mīhrān of Sind or Sind-Sāgar" (Raverty, *J.A.S.B.*, vol. LXI, pt. i. p. 316).

<sup>5</sup> The name is written *بحار برهمنا* Bahar, and *بحار برهمنا* in the MSS. and *بحار برهمنا* in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has *بحار برهمنا*. The correct name of the place, however, was Bahman-ābād or Bahman-nū, the Bahman-no of the Sindīs. It was "founded centuries before, by Bahman son of Isfandiār,

Qāsim arrived in the neighbourhood of the fort of Nīrūn, the residents of the city, being in the first instance frightened by the onsets of the arrival of the army shut themselves up in the fort; and later having arranged and provided for the necessities of the army (*i.e.*, I suppose Muḥammad Qāsim's army) joined it, shouting the word *Al-amān* (quarter or safety). Muḥammad Qāsim granted them quarter, took the heads of the different groups of people with him; and leaving his own superintendent or commander in the fort of Nīrūn, advanced to conquer Siwistān, which is now known as Sihwān.

<sup>1</sup> A number of the inhabitants of Siwistān went to Baḥhrā, who was the ruler of the place, and was the son of the uncle of Rāy Dāhir, and said, "Our religion is safety, and to pardon is our faith, and according to our tenets, slaying and being slain are not allowed. It is advisable that we should petition for protection from the commanders of the army." Rāyzāda Baḥhrā relying on his strength and power uttered harsh and unfitting words (towards them); but in the end after enduring the siege for a week took the path of flight and

in the reign of Gushtāsib sovereign of I-rān-Zamin, who made conquests in valley of the Indus and western Hind, which were retained up to within a few years of the fall of the I-rānī empire" (*vide* note 102, p. 196 of Raverty's paper, *J.A.S.B.*, vol. LXI, pt. i). In another note, No. 105, page 196, Raverty says "This place Bahmanābād or Bahman-nih, notwithstanding that more than one old author distinctly states by whom it was founded, European writers (and Nizam-ud-din and Firishtah also) insist in calling 'Brahmanābād', because it is incorrect, seemingly."

<sup>1</sup> There are differences in the readings here. One MS. has مردم انولایت نرد. و جمعی از سکنه سیستان. The other has مجمعہ کہ حاکم انجا و ابن عم رای دابر بود و جمعی از سکنه سیستان نرد بچرا کہ حاکم انجا و ابن عم رای دابر بود. Firishtah lith. ed. has مردم سیستان کہ همه برعمی بودند نرد حاکم خود کچرای کہ ابن دابر بود. It appears from comparing these that the inhabitants, who, according to Firishtah, were all Brahmans went to the ruler of the place, who according to one MS. of the Ṭabaqāt was called, apparently incorrectly, Muḥammad but according to the other and the lith. ed. Bachehra and according to Firishtah Kachrai, and said that they did not want to fight the invaders. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 405) calls the governor of Sehwan Kucha Ray; the Cambridge History of India (p. 3) calls him "Bajhrā, son of Chandra and cousin of Dāhir"; and Raverty also (*J.A.S.B.*, vol. LXI, pt. i, p. 233) has Bajhrā.

prayed for shelter to the Rāy of the fort of <sup>1</sup> Sīsams. Early next morning Muḥammad Qāsim, in concert with the leaders of the different sections of his army, entered the fortress the Siwistān; and granted quarter to those who had not accepted the advice of or shown goodwill to Rāyzāda Baḥhrā. He divided the booty and the fruits of the conquest of Siwistān among the troops, after setting apart a fifth part (to be sent to Ḥajjāj); and then turned his face towards the fort of Sīsam. After the conquest of that fort he advanced to engage Rāy Dāhir, who was the head of the disturbance, and the chief of the disturbers.

While this was going on, there was a <sup>2</sup> dearth of commodities in the army of Muḥammad Qāsim; and most of the beasts of burden became lame (and unfit for work); and owing to this anxiety and distress regarding the condition of the troops became apparent. Ḥajjāj, son of Yūsuf, becoming acquainted with the true state of things, after making necessary preparations, sent to Muḥammad Qāsim two thousand horses from his own stables, and the soldiers having gained fresh strength advanced to attack Rāy Dāhir. After the parties met, a series of battles took place one after another. They say that while these things were going on, Rāy Dāhir sent for the astrologers to attend on him in his private chamber; and asked that the circumstances and the aim of the 'Arab army to be explained to him. The astrologers, who knew the stars, said, "We have read in ancient books that in the lunar year 86, the 'Arab army would take possession of the country

<sup>1</sup> The name is written as ششم in both MSS. and in the lith. ed. of the *Ṭabaqāt*. Firishtah lith. ed. has سلم, and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 406) has Sulim. The Cambridge History of India (p. 4) has Sīsam. Raverty calls it Sīsam, Sahbūn and Silam of others (*J.A.S.B.*, vol. LXI, pt. i, p. 233). In the text-edition it is ششم.

<sup>2</sup> This dearth is also mentioned by Arab historians (*vide* Raverty, *J.A.S.B.*, vol. LXI, pt. i, p. 237). Muḥammad had to build a bridge of boats to take his army over to the Bahmanūbād side of the Mihrān. The bridge was constructed, and the army crossed without much opposition on the part of Dāhir. Major Raverty also says that the writers do not mention the difficulties he had to encounter, such as the delay in obtaining boats, the want of food and forage, and the consequent loss of men and horses from disease, and months that elapsed in the meantime. It is not clear where he got the information about the delay and the difficulties.



round Dēbul; and that in the year 93 they would gain possession of the whole country of Sind." As he had repeatedly examined the astrologers, he knew that in forecasting the influence of the stars, they were sure and protected against all errors and mistakes, he grappled (with the difficulties of his position); and as the cup of his life had begun to overflow, he, on Thursday the 10th of the auspicious month of Ramaḍān in the year 993 A.H., turned the face of his spirit with the greatest vigour to the <sup>1</sup> battle-field; and with the help of the greatest endeavour and exertion, shot every arrow, which he had in the quiver of his devices, at the enemy, and struck by the arrow of fate died. A summary of the circumstances attending the death of Dāhir Rāy is as follows: that on the day of battle he, riding on a white elephant, took his place in the centre of the line of warriors and exerted himself with great gallantry and showed himself to be an expert archer. While the brave men of the two sides and the warriors of the two armies were mingled with each other, a thrower of *naphtha* (or an archer) shooting arrows tipped with *naphtha* struck a flame of fire at the *howdah* of the white elephant on which Rāy Dāhir was seated. The elephant was frightened and began to run away; and although the driver struck it with the hooked goad <sup>2</sup> it had not even the power of a whip with which one strikes an 'Arab horse. The elephant fled and got into the river. The warriors of Muḥammad Qāsim's army pursued it from behind, and sent the message of death by the tongues of their arrows from different directions. After he had received many

---

<sup>1</sup> The account of the battle in the Ṭabaqāt, which appears to be copied from the *Chach-nāma* (Elliot, vol. I, p. 170), is encumbered in the earlier part with Dāhir's consultation with the astrologers and much figurative language. The actual circumstances attending the death of Dāhir, due to the elephant on which he was riding being frightened are, however, described here clearly. Firishtah's account is somewhat different and more matter of fact. The account given in Raverty (*J.A.S.B.*, vol. LXI, pt. i, p. 239) is rather brief, and gives no details. The Cambridge History of India (p. 5) gives a circumstantial account, which agrees mainly with that given by Firishtah and may have been taken from it.

<sup>2</sup> The words are in one MS. حکم تازیانه نداشت که بر اسب عربی بزنند. In the other MS. and in the lith. ed. are the same, with the difference that the word is داشت in one MS. and نداشت in the other and in the lith. ed. In the text-edition داشت has been adopted.

wounds,<sup>1</sup> he returned to the bank of the river. The elephant came out in its own way and made the horsemen run away in all directions. At this time acting with great gallantry Rāy Dāhir, wounded as he was, descended from the elephant by such device as he could think of, and confronted one of the brave 'Arab warriors. The latter with one blow carried to its end that half-finished life. The Rāys and Rājputs, on seeing this, threw the dust of misery on their heads and took the way of flight; and the brave 'Arab warriors mingling with the Rājputs pursued the latter as far as the gate of the fortress. They cast down many of the infidel warriors after aspersing them of cowardice by the thrusts of their spears. So much plunder and booty fell into the hands of the soldiers that these were beyond one's ideas and estimates.

<sup>2</sup> Rayzāda Jay Sinha, after making the fortress strong by putting into it a garrison of brave warriors, wanted to come out and again engage in a drawn battle; but the representatives and ministers of his father did not permit that he should again fight a battle, and they carried him away to the old fort of Brahman-ābād (Bahmanābād). Rāy Dāhir's widow, however, disagreeing with her son, strengthened

<sup>1</sup> The readings here are also different. The MSS. have *و بر کنار دریای* و در کنار دریا شور و شغب شد, while the lith. ed. has *در کنار دریا شور و شغب شد*. Firishtah has no passage, which is exactly similar to this. I cannot find any meaning of *شعب* or *شعب* which will at all fit in with the context. The Cambridge History of India (p. 5) has "the driver arrested his flight in midstream, and induced him once more to face the enemy." This seems to be the meaning but I cannot get the word to fit in. The account of the battle in the *Chach-nama* (vide Elliot, vol. 1, p. 179) is "Dāhir and the driver were carried into the rolling waves."

<sup>2</sup> On the other hand, Firishtah and the Cambridge History of India (p. 5) say that he was struck by an arrow and fell from the elephant. For accounts of the events just before the battle see note No. 187 in Raverty's paper (*J.A.S.B.*, vol. LXI, pt. i, p. 239), but it does not give any detailed account of the final battle. It only says, "the Arabs made a general attack on Dāhir and his forces; and he was finally killed near the fort of Rāwar, between the Mihrān river and the canals of Dadahah Wāh, in endeavouring to reach the fortress, and his troops were overthrown with great slaughter, and pursued to the gates of that place." These details do not agree with the accounts of the battle as given by Nizām-ud-dīn or Firishtah or the Cambridge History of India.

<sup>3</sup> The following account agrees with that in Raverty's paper (*J.A.S.B.*, vol. LXI, pt. i, p. 239). The widow was named Rānī Bā'i, and she is stated to have been a sister of Dāhir.

the gates of the fortress; and making fifteen thousand Rājput̃s join her prepared to defend it. 'Imād-ud-dīn Muḥammad Qāsim, <sup>1</sup> considering the conquest of the fortress of <sup>2</sup> Rāwar to be easy, and thinking that this should be done before the destruction of Jay Sinha, turned his bridle from the battle-field for the capture of the fortress of Rāwar, and surrounded it. After some days, when the people of the fortress were reduced to straits, they lighted a <sup>3</sup> great fire and threw their women and children into it; and opening the gates of the city prepared for battle and slaughter. The Syrian warriors, drawing their blood-drinking swords from the scabbards, entered the fortress and slew six thousand Rājput̃s; and thirty thousand were seized as slaves. The daughters of Rāy Dāhir, who fell into the hands of the conquerors among the prisoners, were sent as a present for the service of the *Khalīfa*. When they came before the latter's eyes, he made them over to the servants of the harem, so that they might attend to their wants for some days, and then had them brought to his presence. He wanted that he would have <sup>4</sup> one of them to share his bed. She

<sup>1</sup> The readings are different and none of them appears to be quite correct.

One MS. has تسخير حصار وا کرده حصار مذکور را درمیان گرفتند. The other has تسخير حصار را در راه اسان دانسته شغل انرا بر دفع جسه مقدم دانست و از جنگ گاه عنان بصوب تسخير وا گردانیده حصار مذکور را درمیان گرفتند. The lith. ed. has تسخير حصار در راه اسان دانسته شغل انرا بر دفع جسنه مقدم داشت و از راه جنگ گاه عنان بصوب تسخير در گردانید - حصار مذکور را درمیان گرفتند. It would be seen that the 2nd MS. and the lith. ed. agree very much. If the حصار در is a mistake for حصار راور, the reading in the lith. ed. may be accepted, after substituting راور for در, and I have made my translation accordingly.

<sup>2</sup> The name of the fortress is not mentioned in the text-edition.

<sup>3</sup> The *Jauhar* could not have been very complete.

<sup>4</sup> The words are یکی را بملک الیمین تصرف نماید. The circumstances of the accusation made by Dāhir's daughter, which she afterwards declared to be false, and which she said she had made to avenge the killing of her father are mentioned by Firishtah, but not by Al Bilāduri, who says (*vide* Elliot, vol. I, p. 124) that after Walid's death his brother Sulaimān became the Caliph. He appointed Sālīh to collect a tribute of 'Irāk. Yazīd was made governor of Sind, and Muhammad was sent back a prisoner, and was kept in prison at Wāsit, where he was put to torture with other members of the family of Abū 'Ukail, until they

submitted, "I do not possess the status of being honoured with the association of the *Khalifa's* bed, for 'Imād-ud-dīn Muḥammad Qāsim had kept me for three nights in his own harem." The *Khalifa*, being overpowered by an access of rage, wrote an order with his own hand that Muḥammad Qāsim, wherever he might have arrived at the time (the order should reach him), should put himself (sew himself up) in raw hide, and should start for the capital. The helpless man had himself sewn up in a raw hide, and ordered that he should be placed in a box, and should be sent to the capital. He died in the course of two or three days. They carried him in the way described.<sup>1</sup>

In short, when the country of Sind came, without dispute and hostility into the possession of the agents of the government of 'Imād-ud-dīn Muḥammad Qāsim, he appointed his own officers and agents in each town and city.

Historical works are wanting and destitute of accounts of the events which happened in Sind (after this date), and in no history are the circumstances connected with the events and the people of the country narrated either as a whole or in detail. But the writer of the history called the *Ṭabaqāt-i-Bahādur Shāhī* has given the name of some of those who were engaged in the government of the country in certain years, and has written only this much in reference to each of them, that he was occupied with the work of government for some years. 1, Nizām-ud-dīn Aḥmad, the compiler of this history, relying on the history of the *Ṭabaqāt-i-Bahādur Shāhī*, <sup>2</sup> follow in his service by

---

expired, for Hajjāj (Muhammad's cousin) had put Adam, Sālih's brother, who professed the creed of the Khārijīs, to death. The *Imperial Gazetteer* (vol. XXII, p. 395, 1908) repeats the story of Dahir's daughters. The Cambridge History of India, page 7, says that the story of Muhammad's death is related by some Chroniclers, and has been repeated by European Historians, but is without any foundation.

<sup>1</sup> The lith. ed. inserts here *و باتى غنايم را برين قياس بايد کرد* i.e., and the remaining booty might be estimated in accordance with this; but as these words do not appear in either of the MSS., I have not inserted them in the text.

<sup>2</sup> The meanings of the words *اقتدا بخدمتش مينمايد* are not very clear. It is not possible to be definite as to who is intended to by the pronomial *ش* unless it is Akbar.

narrating the names of some of them, and <sup>1</sup>some of the circumstances which were included in the things known to the slave of the threshold of his Majesty the *Khalifa-i-Ilāhī Akbār Shāh*. And all help and all defence is from God!

The compiler of the history called the *Tabaqāt-i-Bahādur Shāhī* says, that in the earlier times the government and the rule of the country of Sind were vested in the children of <sup>2</sup>Tamīm Anṣārī. Afterwards as among the *zamīndārs* (land-holders or chiefs) of that country, the <sup>3</sup>*Sūmrās* were distinguished by great power and numbers of followers, they, in the course of time, having gained great power, became invested with the work of government. For <sup>4</sup>five hundred years the government of the country remained with the house of *Sūmrās*. But as it is incidental with the revolution of the skies, or rather as it is incidental with all governments, that they are transferred from one tribe to another, after five hundred years the chieftainship of the country of Sind was transferred from the *Sūmrās* to the

<sup>1</sup> The word بندی in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. is meaningless in reference to the context. I have ventured to change it to چندی, while in the text-edition نبذی.

<sup>2</sup> Tamīm, the son of Dhaid-ul-'Utbā, succeeded Junair in Sind, when the latter was promoted to the Viceroyalty of the eastern provinces of the Caliphate.

<sup>3</sup> For an account of the *Sumras* see the translation of the extract from the *Tārīkh-u-Sind* or *Tārīkh-i-Ma'sūmī* (Elliot, vol. 1, pp. 215-223). It is described as an account of the *Samma* dynasty but is really an account of the *Sumras*. The account of the *Sammās* does not begin till page 223. It is said on that page that "some men of the tribe of *Samma* had previously come from Kachh and had settled in Sind." M. Hidayat Hosain has زمینداران آن ناحیہ in the text-edition.

<sup>4</sup> Firishtah lith. ed. has one hundred years, but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 411) agrees with the *Tabaqāt* and makes the period of domination of the *Soomras* five hundred years. The Cambridge History of India only mentions the *Sūmrās*, on page 54, where it mentions Malik Sinān-ud-dīn Chatīsar, eleventh of the *Sūmra* line, a Rājput dynasty the latter members of which accepted Islām, submitted and was permitted to retain his territory as a vassal of Ilutmish (commonly called Altamsh). Wunār, another chief of the *Sūmrās*, is mentioned on page 147 in connection with the account of Moorish traveller in his *Tuhfat-un-Nazzār fi Gharāib-il-Amsār*, who visited India in the reign of Muhammad Tughluq.

dynasty of <sup>1</sup> Sēmmas. Of this dynasty fifteen persons were engaged in the <sup>2</sup> government (of Sind).

#### AN ACCOUNT OF THE GOVERNMENT OF <sup>3</sup> JĀM ĀNAR.

He was the man in the tribe of Sēmmas who was vested with the office of government and rule. The tribe of the Sēmmas considered themselves to be descended from Jamshīd, and traced their genealogy to him. This word Jām, which they gave to their leaders and chiefs, preserves the memory of that connection. The period of the rule of this Jām was three years and six months.

#### <sup>4</sup> JĀM JŪNĀN.

When Jām Ānar drank a draught from the full cup of death, his brother, Jām Jūnān, in <sup>5</sup> virtue of a mandate or testament, became

<sup>1</sup> They appear to be mentioned for the first time in the *Chach-nāma* (Elliot, vol. I, p. 191) as coming to receive Muhammad Kāsīm "ringing bells and beating drums and dancing." Kharīm, the son of 'Umar, pointed out to Muhammad Kāsīm they were submissive and obedient to the 'Arab. Muhammad Kāsīm laughed at the words and told Kharīm, "You shall be made their chief," and made them dance and play before him. They are called Sammās in the *Cambridge History of India* (p. 500), and are described there as a Rājput tribe of Cutch and lower Sind and who ousted the Sūmras. On page 518, it is said that the "Sammā Rājputs of Sind fleeing from that country before the Sūmras, who had superseded them as its rulers, found an asylum with the Chāvada Rājputs who ruled Cutch." M. Hidayat Hosain has بطبقه سيمكان in the text-edition.

<sup>2</sup> Firishtah inserts an account of Nāsir-ud-dīn Qubācha before giving an account of the Sēmmas. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, pp. 413-421) also devotes some nine pages to the reign of Naseer-ood-Deen Kubbacha.

<sup>3</sup> He is called Unar in the *Tārīkh-u-s-Sind* (Elliot, vol. I, p. 224) and in the *Imperial Gazetteer* (vol. XXII, p. 396) and is described "as a Muhammadan with a Hindu name, a fact which seems argue recent conversion." The *Tārīkh-u-s-Sind* gives an account of the conquest of Siwistān or Sihwān by him. He is called جام افرا in the lith. ed. of Firishtah and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 423) calls him Jam Afra. جام آئر Jām Ānar in the text-edition.

<sup>4</sup> The *Tārīkh-u-s-Sind* and the *Imperial Gazetteer* and Firishtah call him Jām Junā. In his reign Bhakkar was rested from the Turks or Arabs. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 423) calls him Jam Choban. In the text-edition the heading is ذکر حکومت جان جرنان.

<sup>5</sup> There are differences in the readings here. One MS. has بحکومت وصایت while the lith. ed. has بحکم وصایت, the other has وراثت یا وراثت, یا وارث.

vested with the rule and chieftainship of the country of Sind. In the time of his greatness the buds of the desire and hopes of the people blossomed. The period of his rule was fourteen years.

#### AN ACCOUNT OF <sup>1</sup>JĀM MALĪTHA, SON OF JĀM ĀNAR.

When Jām Jūnān passed away Jām Malītha <sup>2</sup> rose to demand the inheritance of his father's dominions and made the people combine with him. And Sulṭān Firūz Shāh came repeatedly to the country of Sind with his army, and the above-named Jām arranging his troops in the field of battle attempted to withstand him. But at last, on the third occasion, the country passed into the possession of his servants. Sulṭān Firūz Shāh took the Jām with him to Dehli; and as the latter performed praiseworthy services, the Sulṭān conferred many favours on him, gave him the (royal) umbrella, and again entrusted the government of the country of Sind to him, and granted him permission to return there. <sup>3</sup> The particulars of these transactions have been written in the section about (the Sulṭāns of) Dehli.

The total period of his rule was fifteen years.

#### AN ACCOUNT OF THE GOVERNMENT OF <sup>4</sup>JĀM TAMĀCHĪ.

After the death of his brother he sat on the bed (*Chahār bālīsh*, i.e., a raised bed with four bolsters round it) of rule and carried out

بوارثت. I think the last is the best reading, and this is followed in the text-edition.

<sup>1</sup> The name is مالی تهته in one MS. and مالتهته in the other, and مالی تهسه in the lith. ed. Firishtah calls him جام بانى. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 423) has Jam Bany. Neither *Tārīkhu-s-Sind* nor the *Imperial Gazetteer* includes him in the list of the Jāms. Both make Jām Tamāchī succeed Jām Junā. In the text-edition it is ذکر حکومت جام بان عتیه بن جام انر.

<sup>2</sup> One MS. substitutes امرا مصدی حکومت گردید in place of بطلب باتفاق which is in the other and in the lith. ed. وراثت ملک پدر بر خواسته مردم را بخود موافق ساخت

<sup>3</sup> See page 247 of vol. I of the English translation.

<sup>4</sup> The name is Jām Tamāchī in one MS. and in the lith. ed. It is Jām Tamājī in the other MS. and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 424) has Jam Timmajy. The *Tārīkhu-s-Sind* and the *Imperial Gazetteer* make him the successor of Jām Jūna. The former (Elliot, vol. I, p. 225) says that the troops of 'Alāu-d-din took him prisoner and carried him with his family to Dehli.





Owing to this union the different sections of the people enjoyed the peace in (seats of) safety, during the time of his rule. He passed away after ruling for six years and some months.

<sup>1</sup> JĀM KARN, SON OF JĀM TAMĀCHĪ.

When Jām 'Alī Shēr drank what was left at the bottom of the brimming goblet of death, Jām Karn, imagining that when a man's father was the king and ruler of a country he should, also, even without the help and favour of providence, attain to that greatness, sat with audacity on the seat of the great. But as time does not tolerate such acts, after a day and a half it poured a draught of failure and death into his throat.

<sup>2</sup> JĀM FATH KHĀN, SON OF SIKANDAR KHĀN.

As the country remained vacant and unoccupied by the person of a ruler, the great men of the tribe and the nobles of the kingdom made Jām Fath Khān, son of Sikandar Khān, who possessed the necessary skill for that high office, the ruler of the country. He died of natural death after having occupied this noble position for fifteen years and some months.

<sup>1</sup> The heading in the MSS. is as I have it in the text. But one MS. has Karūn instead of Karn. The lith. ed. prefixes ذکّر حکومت before جام کرن. According to the *Tārīkh-u-s-Sind* (Elliot, vol. I, pp. 228, 229) he was displeased with the nobles and the great men of the city, .....to slay some, and confine the rest. On the day that he ascended the throne, or the day after, he held a public court, and summoned all men great and small to attend. He addressed them in conciliatory terms. Dinner was served, and after its conclusion he arose to retire to his chamber, when a party of men who had been employed for the purpose, met him at the door of his room and cut him to pieces. In the text-edition ذکّر حکومت is added before the heading as given above.

<sup>2</sup> The heading in the MSS. is what I have it in the text, but one MS. omits the word Khān after Sikandar. The lith. ed. prefixes *Dhikr* before Jām and also omits Khān after Sikandar. The *Tārīkh-u-s-Sind* (Elliot, vol. I, p. 229) says that it was in Jām Fath Khān's time that Mirzā Pīr Muhammad, grandson of 'Timūr, seized the towns of Multān and Uch. It also relates that one Saiyid Abū-l L'āl's interceded with Mirzā Pīr Muhammad for the people. Here again ذکّر حکومت is added before the heading in the text-edition.



Jām Iskandar, who in addition to the rights of inheritance possessed the qualifications for the government of the empire, to be the ruler (of the country). He passed away after performing the duties of the government for one year and six months.

### JĀM SANJAR.

When Jām Iskandar after partaking of worldly pleasures passed away to his appointed place (i.e., died), the chief men of Sind selected Jām Sanjar, who at that time was occupied in the performance of the duties of the government, to be their chief. He accepted the summons of death, after having been engaged with the performance of the work of government for eight years and some months.

### JĀM NIZĀM-UD-DĪN, WHO IS KNOWN AS JĀM NANDĀ.

After Jām Sanjar, Jām Nizām-ud-dīn who is known as Jām Nandā, occupied himself with the performance of the duties of the government. In his reign the country of Sind acquired new grandeur. He was contemporaneous with Sulṭān Ḥusain Lankāh ruler of Multān. <sup>1</sup> In his time also in the year 899 A.H., Shāh Bēg came from Qandahār, and having conquered the fort of Sēwī, which was in the charge of Bahādur Khān the Jām's agent, returned to Qandahār, leaving his younger brother Sulṭān Muḥammad there. Jām Nandā sent Mubārak Khān to attack Sulṭān Muḥammad, and the latter being killed in the battle which ensued, Sēwī again came into the Jām's possession. On hearing this news, Shāh Bēg sent Mīrzā 'Īsa Tarkhān to avenge the death of his brother. Mīrzā 'Īsa fought with the Jām's army, and defeated it. After that Shāh Bēg also arrived there and took possession of the fort of <sup>2</sup> Bhakkar, by the capitulation of <sup>3</sup> Qāḍī Qādan, the agent

---

prosperous in his time. He improved the judicial administration by increasing the pay of the Kāzis, who had before been badly paid; and used to take money from both plainiffs and defendants of suits they tried (p. 232). In the text-edition there is **ذکر حکومت** before the heading of this Jām also.

<sup>1</sup> The account of Shāh Bēg's invasion given in the *Tārīkh-u-s-Sind* (Elliot, vol. I. p. 234) differs materially from that in the *Ṭabaqāt*, according to the former it was altogether unsuccessful, but Firishtah agrees with the *Ṭabaqāt*.

<sup>2</sup> The name of the Bhakkar fort in the text-edition is given as **بکر**.

<sup>3</sup> The name is Qāḍī Qādan in the lith. ed. of the *Ṭabaqāt* and of Firishtah, but it is Qāḍī Dādan in both MSS. of the *Ṭabaqāt*. A Kāzī Kāzim is mentioned

of the Jām, and left it in charge of Fāḍil Bēg Kōkaltāsh. At that time the fort of Bhakkar was not so strong as it is now. He also seized the fort of Sihwān, and making it over to Khwājah Bāqī Bēg returned to Qandahār. Jām Nandū repeatedly sent armies to recover possession of Sēwī; but it was of no avail.

Jām Nandū, who had ruled for sixty-two years, now passed away.

### <sup>1</sup> AN ACCOUNT OF THE GOVERNMENT OF JĀM FIRŪZ.

Jām Firūz the son of Nizām-ud-dīn succeeded his father, and the duties of the *vazārat* became vested in Daryā Khān, who was one of his near relations, and he acquired all power. Jām Ṣalāḥ-ud-dīn, who was a relation of Jām Firūz, and considered himself to be the

on page 310 of Elliot, vol. I, as a most distinguished scholar by whose strenuous exertions the outrages which were being committed by order of Shāh Beg's soldiers on their entry into Thatta were put an end to. If this be the correct name it would be written according to the rules of transliteration now followed as Qāḍī Qāzīm.

<sup>1</sup> Neither of the MSS. has the heading giving the name of Jām Firūz; but after گذشت goes on as و پسر او جام فیروز. The lith. ed. has usual heading ذکر حکومت جام فیروز. I have followed the heading in the lith. ed. according to the *Tārīkh-u-Sind* (Elliot, vol. I, pp. 234, 235). Jām Firuz was of tender years, and Ṣalāḥ-ud-dīn, who was the son of Jām Sanjar's daughter, had pretensions to the throne; but Daryā Khān and Sūrang Khān, who were powerful slaves of Jām Nizām-ud-dīn, placed Jām Firuz on the throne, with the consent of the nobles and the head men of Thatta. After Ṣalāḥ-ud-dīn had gone to Guzerāt, Jām Firuz gave himself up to low pleasures; and Daryā Khān retired in disgust to his *jagīr*. The nobles being on the verge of ruin, owing to Jām Firuz's dissipation, sent a messenger to summon Ṣalāḥ-ud-dīn. He came and Jām Firuz's followers led the latter out of the city on one side, while Jām Ṣalāḥ-ud-dīn entered it on the other. Then Jām Firuz's mother took the latter to Daryā Khān and he was induced to collect troops, and to advance to attack Ṣalāḥ-ud-dīn. The latter wanted to go out, and meet the enemy; but his *wazīr* Bāji told him not to do so, and himself went up. He defeated Daryā Khān's troops; and sent a messenger to inform Ṣalāḥ-ud-dīn of the victory. The messenger was intercepted by Daryā Khān, who substituted a letter, which purported to come from the *wazīr*, and in which Ṣalāḥ-ud-dīn was informed that his army had been defeated, and he must leave Thatta at once with his family. He did so, and Daryā Khān took Jām Firuz to Thatta where he reigned securely for some years, until the end of 910 A.H. (1511 A.D.) when Shāh Beg Arghūn invaded Sind. A foot-note says that 910 A.H., is a mistake, and 920 A.H. (1520 A.D.) is the correct year.

heir to the kingdom, commenced hostilities and warfare; but as he could not effect anything, he fled to Gujrāt, and prayed Sultān Muẓaffar Gujrātī for help. As the wife of Sultān Muẓaffar was the daughter of the uncle of Jām Ṣalāḥ-ud-dīn, he extended the hand of his support, and spread the wing of his affection over his head; and sending a considerable army with him, gave him leave to go to Thatha. As Daryā Khān, who was all-powerful and on whom everything depended, had now combined with Jām Ṣalāḥ-ud-dīn, the country of Sind came into the latter's possession without any dispute or fighting. Jām Firūz betook himself to a corner, hoping for the blowing of the breeze of prosperity, and waiting for the rising of the star of good fortune. In the end Daryā Khān, who had the reins of power of the kingdom in his hands, summoned Jām Firūz, and raised him to the chieftainship.

Jām Ṣalāḥ-ud-dīn, scratching the back of his head, went again to Gujrāt. Sultān Muẓaffar again made preparations to help him, and <sup>1</sup> in the year 920 A.H., sent him to Sind; and he turned Jām Firūz <sup>2</sup> *Khvajahdār* out of Sind and himself took possession of the country. Jām Firūz had necessarily then to seek for help from <sup>3</sup> Shāhī Bēg Arghūn. The latter sent his slave, who had the name of Sanbal Khān, to help him. He brought Shāhī Bēg's army with him and had a drawn battle with Jām Ṣalāḥ-ud-dīn in the neighbourhood of Sihwān; and Jām Ṣalāḥ-ud-dīn and his son Haibat Khān were slain in this battle; and the country of Sind again, as at an earlier time, came to the possession of Jām Firūz.

At this time, which was the time of interregnum, Shāh Bēg into whose mind a desire for the conquest of Sind had found its way, and who was watching for an opportunity, marched out from Qandahār, and in the year 927 A.H., took possession of Thatha. The date of the capture of Thatha has been found in the words *Kharābī-i-Sind* (the ruin of Sind). Daryā Khān, who was in charge of Jām Firūz's

---

<sup>1</sup> Both MSS. have 928 A.H., but the lith. ed. has 920 A.H. As Shāh Bēg Arghūn invaded Sind in 926 A.H. (see the last part of the preceding note) I think 920 A.H., is the correct year.

<sup>2</sup> This word has occurred twice previously, but it has not been possible to find its exact meaning.

<sup>3</sup> One MS. and the lith. ed. have Shāhī Bēg, but the other MS. has Shāh Bēg.

government, was put to death. Jām Fīrūz being completely helpless abandoned Sind, and sought the protection of Sultān Muẓaffar Gujrātī. As at this time Sultān Muẓaffar died a natural death, Jām Fīrūz again came to Sind; but, as he saw, that he was unable to effect anything, he returned to Gujrāt. He gave his daughter in marriage to Sultān Bahādūr Gujrātī; and became enlisted among the latter's *amīrs*. The power of the dynasty of the *Sēmmas* having been cut off, the duties of government now devolved on Shāh Bēg.

### 1 AN ACCOUNT OF SHĀH BĒG ARGHŪN.

<sup>2</sup> This Shāh Bēg was the son of Mīr Dhūalnūn Bēg, who was the *Amīr-ul-umarā* (chief nobleman) and *sipāhsālar* (commander-in-chief) of Sultān Mirzā, and *atāliq* (guardian) of the son, Badi'-uz-zamān Mirzā. From before (the time of) Sultān Husain Mirzā he held the government of Qandahār. <sup>3</sup> Amīr Dhūalnūn Bēg was slain in the battle with <sup>4</sup> Shāhī Bēg Ūzbak, who was at war with the sons of Sultān Husain Mirzā. <sup>5</sup> The government of Qandahār descended to his son

---

<sup>1</sup> The heading is as I have it in the text in one MS. In the other the word Arghūn is omitted. In the lith. ed. it is ذکر حکومت شاه بیگ.

<sup>2</sup> For a detailed history of Shāh Beg, and his father Amīr Zū-n Nūn, see the *Tarkhān-nāma* (Elliot, vol. I, pp. 303-312). The Cambridge History of India, (p. 501) only gives the years of Shāh Beg's invasion of Sind, and of his death.

<sup>3</sup> The name is ذوالنون بیگ in this passage in both MSS., but the prefix *Mīr* is omitted in the lith. ed. As he is generally called Amīr Zū-n Nun Beg in the *Tarkhān-nāma* and other histories, I have changed the *Mīr* to Amīr. In the text-edition, however, میر is retained.

<sup>4</sup> The name is incorrectly written as Shāhī Bēg Ūzbak in both the MSS. and in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has, somewhat more correctly, سبیک خان اوزبک. The name in the *Tarkhān-nāma* (Elliot, vol. I, p. 304) is Muhammad Khān Shaibānī Ūzbek.

<sup>5</sup> As a matter of fact, according to the *Tarkhān-nāma* (Elliot, vol. I, pp. 306-309) Shāh Beg who succeeded his father in 913 A.H. found his position in Kandahār precarious in 915 A.H., owing to his being threatened on one side by Shāh Isma'il the second, who had conquered Khurāsān, and on the other by Bābar, who had seized Kābul, and had determined to seize the Sīwī territory as a future asylum. Accordingly in 917 A.H., he defeated Sultān Purdili Birlās, who ruled there, and took possession of Sīwī, and left a garrison there under

Shāh Bēg, who became his successor, and having conquered the greater part of the country of Sind, gained great power.

<sup>1</sup> He had great literary accomplishment also; and he wrote a <sup>2</sup> commentary on the 'Aqā'id-i-Nasafī, and a commentary on the *Kāfiā* and a *Hāshīa* (super-commentary) on the *Maṭālī-i-Manṭiq*, and was also a man of pure morals. In the lines (of battle), he always advanced in front of every one, and although people forbade him from doing so and said, "This kind of reckless bravery is not right for a leader," it had no effect. He always said, "At such a time I lose all control over myself, and it comes into my mind that no one should stand in front of me." <sup>3</sup> He died in the year 930 A.H., and his son Shāh Ḥusain took his place.

Mirzā 'Isā Tarkhān. In 919 A.H., Bābar again invaded Kandahār, but went back to Kābul without conquering it. Shāh Beg did not, however, consider his position to be safe there, and resolved to conquer Sind. Bābar invaded Kandahār again in 921 and 922 A.H.; and Shāh Beg, wearied by these repeated invasions, made over Kandahār to Bābar by an amicable settlement. After that he passed two years in Shāl and Siwī in great penury and distress; but in 924 A.H., he invaded Sind; and after defeating Daryā Khān in a great battle occupied Thatta.

<sup>1</sup> There is nothing about Shāh Beg Arghūn's literary works in the extract from the *Tarkhān-nāma* as given in Elliot.

<sup>2</sup> The *Sharḥ bar Aqā'id Nasafī* is a commentary on scholastic theology called *Al-'Aqā'id an Nasafīya*. The full name of *Nasafī* was Najm-ud-dīn Abū Ḥafṣ 'Umar bin Muḥammad-an-Nasafī; he was born in 460 A.H., and died in 537 A.H., 1142 A.D. (*vide* Brocklemann *Geschichte der Arabischen Litteratur*, vol. I, p. 427, 1898). عقائد نفسي in the text-edition.

The *Hāshīa bar Maṭālī' Manṭiq* is a super-commentary on the commentary of *Maṭālī'-al-Anwār*. The first part of the work deals with logic. The author of the *Maṭālī'* was Maḥmūd bin Abī Bakr-Al-'Urmavi, who died in 682 A.H., 1283 A.D. (*vide* Brocklemann, vol. I, p. 467).

The *Sharḥ bar Kāfiā* is a commentary on Ibn Ḥajīb's well-known work on syntax called *Kāfiā*. The full name of Ibn Ḥajīb was 'Uṭhmān bin 'Umar, who died in 646 A.H., 1248 A.D. (*vide* Brocklemann, vol. I, p. 303).

<sup>3</sup> The year is 930 in both MSS. and in the lith. ed. of the *Ṭabaqāt* and of *Firishtah*. The Cambridge History of India (p. 501) agrees with this date and gives 1524 A.D., as the year of Shāh Beg's death. The *Tarkhān-nāma* (Elliot, vol. I, p. 312) however, says that he died in Sha'bān 928 A.H. (June, 1522) *Shahr Sha'bān* is given in it as the chronogram of his death. The *Imperial Gazetteer* (vol. XXII, p. 397) has 1522 as the year of Shāh Beg's death, and agrees with the *Tarkhān-nāma*.





whole of Sind, he became very powerful. He also rebuilt the fort of Bhakkar, and also built a fort of Sihwān; and having occupied himself with the work of government for thirty-two years passed away in the 1 year 962 A.H.

## 2 AN ACCOUNT OF MĪRZĀ 'ĪSĀ TARKHĀN.

<sup>3</sup> Sultān Maḥmūd and Mīrzā 'Īsā Tarkhān ruled at Bhakkar and Thatha respectively, independently of each other. There was sometimes peace and sometimes war between them. Mīrzā 'Īsā ruled for a period of thirteen years, and passed away in the year 975 A.H.

son of Mīrzā 'Īsā, the governor of Thatta; and returned towards Bhakkar and died on the way on the 12th Rabi' u-l-Awwal A.H. 961.

<sup>1</sup> The year is 962 A.H., in both the MSS. and in the lith. ed. of the *Ṭabaqāt*, *Firishtah* lith. ed. also has 962 A.H.; but as will be seen from the preceding note, the *Tarkhān-nāma* has 961 A.H., 1564 A.D. The Cambridge History of India (p. 502) gives 1556 as the year of Shāh Husain's death.

<sup>2</sup> The heading is as I have it in the text in both MSS. The lith. ed. has *Hukūmat* before 'Īsā, and omits *Tarkhān* after it.

<sup>3</sup> *Firishtah*'s account agrees with that in the text; and he very candidly admits that he does not know how the government was transferred from the Arghūns to the *Tarkhāns*.

The *Tarkhān-nāma* (Elliot, vol. I, pp. 323-336) says, that Mīrzā 'Īsā Tarkhān appointed Mīrzā Sālih his second son to be his successor, and made the government over to him, and only retained the name of king. Mīrzā Sālih soon after marched against Siwistān; and wrested it from Maḥmūd Khān Bhakkari. After that Mīrzā 'Īsā Tarkhān led a large force to conquer Bhakkar, but peace was affected, Bhakkar being left to Maḥmūd Khān, while he surrendered Siwistān to Mīrzā 'Īsā. After that Mīrzā Muhammad Bākī, 'Īsā Tarkhān's eldest son, rebelled against him. He was defeated, but afterwards a reconciliation was effected and Mīrzā Muhammad Bākī was sent to Bhakkar. In 970 Mīrzā Sālih was assassinated by a Bulūch named Murīd. Mīrzā 'Īsā then nominated Mīrzā Jān Bābū, his third son, as the heir apparent. People interested themselves in favour of Mīrzā Muhammad Bākī, who was then granted Siwistān as a *jagīr*. Some of the Arghūns then rebelled against Mīrzā 'Īsā, but they were defeated, and fled to Bhakkar for succour. They were helped by Maḥmūd Khān, and besieged Siwistān. Mīrzā 'Īsā advanced from Thatta, and defeated the rebels, and their allies, Maḥmūd Khān's men; and at last a peace was affected. Mīrzā 'Īsā died in 974, after reigning for fourteen years; and Mīrzā Bākī succeeded him, through the help of Māh Begam, although Mīrzā 'Īsā had nominated Mīrzā Jān Bābū as his heir.

1 AN ACCOUNT OF MIRZĀ MUHAMMAD BĀQI, SON OF MIRZĀ  
‘ĪSĀ TARKHĀN.

His (Mirzā ‘Īsā Tarkhān’s) eldest son Muḥammad Bāqī Khān, by 2 virtue of his rectitude, and of the number of his followers, defeated his younger brother Jān Bābā, and took the place of his father. 3 In the manner of the latter, he sometimes had peace and

was sometimes at war with Sultān Maḥmūd. He ruled for a period of eighteen years, and then passed away from the world in the 1 year 993 A.H., and the duties of the government devolved on Mirzā Jānī Bēg.

#### AN ACCOUNT OF MIRZĀ JĀNĪ BĒG.

<sup>2</sup> After Muḥammad Bāqī, the government became vested in Mirzā Jānī Bēg; and in the year 1001 A.H. he became enlisted among the servants of the threshold; and the country of Sind was added to the countries occupied (by Akbar).

#### <sup>3</sup> AN ACCOUNT OF SULTĀN MAḤMŪD.

Sultān Maḥmūd, the ruler of Bhakkar, sat on the *masnad* of rule for twenty years. He was insane and a shedder of blood. Whenever

---

Owing to the bad luck, which follows the shedding of unrighteous blood, he, in the latter part of his life, suffered from melancholia, and (often) talked nonsense, and entrusted great appointments in his government to base men and men of low origin. Wherever there were noble and great men, he had them all put to death by deceit and treachery. For instance, he had Mirak 'Abd-ur-Raḥmān executed, and slew Shaikh 'Abd-ul-wahāb with the unrighteous sword. He had such rigour and evil nature that no one spoke (or dared to speak) the truth to him. He summoned his brother Jām Bābū, under an oath on the sacred word (the *Qurān*), and bringing Mir Saiyid 'Alī, who was one of the nobles and great men of the country, between them, kept him in fear of death for nights and days. At last his insanity becoming very severe he one night killed himself.

There are some slight verbal mistakes in the above passage, but it appears to contain some facts about Mirzā Bāqī, which are correct and which do not appear in the other MS. or in the lith. ed. of the *Ṭabaqāt* or in *Firishtah*. I have, accordingly, thought it fit to transcribe it in a note, though I have not inserted it in the text.

<sup>1</sup> *Firishtah* also gives 993 A.H., and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 440) 993 A.H., 1584 A.D. as the year of his death. The *Cambridge History of India* (p. 502) says, he committed suicide in 1585 A.D., in a fit of insanity. His son Mirzā Pāyanda Muḥammad Tarkhūn was also insane, and so the succession passed to his son Mirzā Jānī Bēg Tarkhān.

<sup>2</sup> He was the grandson of Mirzā Muḥammad Bāqī Tarkhān. The final conquest of Sind by Khān Khānūn 'Abd-ur-Raḥīm Khān, and its inclusion in Akbar's dominion have been described in the history of Akbar's reign.

<sup>3</sup> One MS. has no heading. The other MS. has only the word Sultān Maḥmūd. I have adopted the heading in the lith. ed. but have omitted the word *Hukūmat*. In the text-edition the account of Sultān Maḥmūd forms a part of the description of the reign of Mirzā Jānī Bēg.

he had the least suspicion of anybody, he at once put him to death. He kept the roads of Sind <sup>1</sup> closed from all sides.

## SECTION XI. <sup>2</sup>AN ACCOUNT OF THE DYNASTY OF THE SULTĀNS OF MULTĀN.

Let it not remain concealed that the affairs of the country of Multān have not been written in any history from the date of the introduction of Islām, which resulted from the exertions of Muḥammad Qāsim in the time of Ḥajjaj, son of Yūsuf. When Sultān Maḥmūd Ghaznavī took it out of the possession of the *Mulāhids* (heretics), it remained for a long time in the possession of his descendants. When the power of the Ghaznavīs became enfeebled, the country of Multān again fell into the possession of the *Qarāmiṭah* sect. Then from <sup>3</sup> the time, when it came into the possession of Sultān Mu'izz-ud-dīn Muḥammad Sām, till the year 847 A.H., it remained in the custody and possession of the Sultāns of Dehli. From that year, when there were rulers of different tribes in various parts of India, the rulers of Multān also began to act as independent rulers and Multān went out of the possession of the Sultāns of Dehli; and a number of these rulers ruled in succession.

Shaikh Yūsuf about two years.

Sultān <sup>4</sup> Quṭb-ud-dīn, sixteen years.

<sup>1</sup> Firishtah relates, as in fact is mentioned in the history of the reign of Akbar, that Muḥibb 'Alī Khān conquered the whole territory except the fort of Bhakkar. After that Sultān Maḥmūd sent a petition to Akbar that he would surrender the fort to anyone, except Muḥibb 'Alī Khān, whom he might send. Akbar accordingly sent Gīsū Khān, but before he arrived, Sultān Maḥmūd died; and Gīsū Khān took possession of the fort without any opposition in the year 982 A.H.

<sup>2</sup> The heading in the MSS. is طبقة ملتان and طبقة حكام ملتان. The lith. ed. has ذکر سلاطین طبقه ملتان. I have kept the heading in the lith. ed. as the rulers are called Sultāns in the MSS. also. In the text-edition the heading is ذکر طبقة سلاطین ملتان.

<sup>3</sup> I have adopted the reading of the MSS.; but the lith. ed. has از سنه ۱۷۱۱ i.e., from the year 571 A.H., instead of از آن زمان.

<sup>4</sup> One MS. has Lankāh after the name of Quṭb-ud-dīn, but neither the other MS. nor the lith. ed. has it.

<sup>1</sup> Sultān Ḥusain, according to one statement thirty-four years, and according to another statement thirty-six years.

<sup>2</sup> Sultān Firūz, the period of his rule is not known.

<sup>3</sup> Sultān Maḥmūd *bin* Sultān Firūz *bin* Sultān Ḥusain, twenty-seven years.

<sup>4</sup> Sultān Ḥusain, the period of his rule is not known. According to one statement it was one year and some months.

### AN ACCOUNT OF SHAIKH YŪSUF.

When in the year 847 A.H., the turn of the rule of the empire of Dehli came to Sultān 'Alā-ud-dīn, son of Muḥammad Shāh, son of <sup>5</sup> Farid Shāh, son of Mubārak Shāh, son of Khidr Khān, the work of government and the affairs of the empire fell into disorder; and in the country of India the chiefs of (different) tribes or bands came into existence. The country of Multān remained without a ruler owing to a succession of onsets of the wrath of the Mughals. As the greatness of the noble family of the Shaikh-ut-Tariqa (the Shaikh of the path of truth) Shaikh Bahā'-ud-dīn Zakariyā Multānī, may the Great God sanctify his soul! had made such an impression on the hearts of the residents of Multān and of the *zamīndārs* (petty chiefs), that nothing greater than it can be imagined, all the people high and low, and all

<sup>1</sup> One MS. has سی و چہار سال 34 years; but the other MS. and the lith. ed. have what I have in the text.

<sup>2</sup> This name occurs in one MS. only but not in the other or in the lith. ed.

<sup>3</sup> The heading I have in the text is in one MS. In the other MS. it is Sultān Maḥmūd 27 years; while the lith. ed. has Sultān Maḥmūd 27 years and some months. Probably there was only one Sultān Maḥmūd. There is considerable divergence in the lists of the Sultāns of Multān given in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. One MS. has Shaikh Yūsuf, Sultān Quṭb-ud-dīn, Sultān Ḥusain, Sultān Maḥmūd and Sultān Firūz. The other MS. has the first four names, but has Sultān Ḥusain II, instead of Sultān Firūz. The list in the lith. ed. only consists of the first four names. Firishtah has after the first four Firūz Shah, and then Maḥmūd Shāh, then Shāh Ḥusain II. The correct names and the sequence of the rulers will appear in the course of their history.

<sup>4</sup> This name occurs in one MS. only.

<sup>5</sup> The MSS. have Farid Shāh, and the lith. ed. has Firūz Shāh. Both these are incorrect. Muḥammad Shāh was really the son of Shāhzāda Farid, son of Khidr Khān, and he was adopted by Mubārak Shāh as his son. See page 322, vol. I, of the English translation of this work.

the residents and the inhabitants of that neighbourhood elected Shaikh Yūsuf Zakariyā Quraishī, to whom the superintendence of the *Khānqāh* and the supervision of the surroundings of the sacred tomb of Shaikh Bahā'-ud-dīn Zakariyā appertained, as the ruler of the country; and had public prayers read in his name from the pulpits of Multān and Ucha and some other towns. He then engaged himself in the administration of the government and made a beginning by increasing the number of his retainers and by enlarging his army. He made the hearts of the *zamīndārs* or petty chieftains attached to him; and gave increased currency and splendour to the government of the country.

It so happened, however, that one day Rāy Sahrah, who was the chief of the tribe of *Lankāhs*, and to whom the town of Sēwī and that part of the country appertained, sent a message to Shaikh Yūsuf that "As from the time of my ancestors, the relation-ship of discipleship and belief to your family has remained on a sound basis; and the empire of Dehli is not free from disturbances and disorder; and they say that Malik Bahlūl Lūdi has taken possession of Dehli, and has had public prayers read in his name, if His Holiness, the Shaikh would with the utmost promptitude turn his attention to the tribe of the *Lankāhs*, and consider me among his soldiers, I shall not in every service and expedition, which may take place, consider myself excused from rendering loyal and devoted service, even to the extent of sacrificing my life. Also, at present, in order to strengthen the relationship of being disciple and of devotion and loyalty, I shall give my daughter to you (in marriage), and will accept you as my son-in-law." The Shaikh on hearing these words was delighted in his heart, and took the daughter of Rāy Sahrah in marriage. He (*i.e.*, Rāy Sahrah) sometimes <sup>1</sup> came from Sēwī to Multān to see his daughter and <sup>2</sup> brought fitting presents for the service of the Shaikh. The latter, as a matter of caution, did not allow that Rāy Sahrah should have a mansion in the town of Multān, and therefore, he took up his residence outside the town, and he went alone to see his daughter.

On one occasion, he collected all his men and started for Multān and wanted that with deceit, and the <sup>3</sup> power of trickery and fraud,

<sup>1</sup> One MS. has میرسید instead of امجد.

<sup>2</sup> One MS. has بخدمت شیخ می گذرانید instead of برای شیخ می آورد.

<sup>3</sup> One MS. omits the word دستیاری.

he would seize Shaikh Yūsuf and himself become the ruler of Multān. When he arrived in the neighbourhood of the city he sent the following message to Shaikh Yūsuf, "I have this time brought all the *Lankāhs* with me, so that after inspecting them, you might allot various services to them, according to their qualifications. The simple-minded Shaikh Yūsuf had become careless of the fraud of the age and the deceit of the time, and met him with affection and kindness. Rāy Sahrah, after displaying his grandeur and retinue, came one night to see his daughter attended by only a single servant. He had directed that servant to cut the throat of a kid with his knife in some corner of the house and to bring the blood after heating it, and pouring it into a cup. When the servant carried out the order, Rāy Sahrah drank off the cup of blood. After a time he, acting with deceit and trickery, cried out that he had a severe pain in his stomach; and from time to time his groans and lamentations became louder. At about midnight he summoned the *valīls* (representatives) of Shaikh Yūsuf to attend, so that he might give his last directions to them; and in their presence he vomitted blood. In the meantime, in the course of giving his directions, which were mixed with groans and lamentations, he sent for his retainers and adherents, in order to bid them farewell. As the representative of the Shaikh found the condition of Rāy Sahrah so bad (*lit.* of another kind), they did not at all object to the coming of the Rāy's relatives and adherents. When most of his men had entered the fort, he raised his head from the bed of illness with the intention of seizing the kingdom. He sent his trusted servants, and others who had his confidence to watch and guard all the four gates, so that they would not permit the servants of the Shaikh to come from the outer fort into the city. Then he went to the private apartments of the Shaikh and seized him.

The rule of Shaikh Yūsuf lasted for about two years.

#### AN ACCOUNT OF SULTĀN QUṬB-UD-DĪN LANKĀH.

When Rāy Sahrah seized the Shaikh, he had the public prayers (read), and the coins (struck) in his own name; and assumed the title of Sultān Quṭb-ud-dīn. As the people of Multān were satisfied with his government, and rendered allegiance to him; he sent the Shaikh by the gate which was in the north, and near the tomb, which was the

recipient of rays of refulgence of the Shaikh-ul-Islām Shaikh Bahā'-ud-dīn Zakariyā, and gave him leave to go to Dehlī; and gave orders that the gate should be blocked up with burnt bricks. They also say, that to this day, which is the year 1002 Hijrī that gate has been kept blocked up. He then raised the standard of sovereignty; and occupied himself with the work of government. When Shaikh Yūsuf arrived at Dehlī, Sultān Bahlūl received him with great courtesy and honour; and united his daughter in the bond of marriage with the son of the Shaikh, who bore the name of Shaikh 'Abd-ul-lah and was better known under the name of Shāh 'Abd-ul-lah. With his promises<sup>1</sup> he always kept the Shaikh<sup>2</sup> strengthened in his heart, and pleased and hopeful. Sultān Quṭb-ud-dīn ruled independently in the country of Multān, till, after a long time in the year<sup>3</sup> 865 A.H. he accepted (the summons of) the just God.

The period of the rule of Sultān Quṭb-ud-dīn was prolonged to sixteen years.

#### AN ACCOUNT OF SULTĀN ḤUSAIN, SON OF SULTĀN<sup>4</sup> QUṬB-UD-DIN.

When Sultān Quṭb-ud-dīn surrendered his borrowed life to the true owner of it (i.e., God), the *amīrs* and the pillars of the state of Sultān Quṭb-ud-dīn, after the ceremonies of mourning, gave the title of Sultān Ḥusain to his eldest son, and had the public prayers read in his name in Multān and the territories surrounding it. And he was

<sup>1</sup> The word is *منتظر* in one MS. and in the lith. ed. of *Firishtah*, *منتفاد* in the other MS., and *منتظر* in the lith. ed. of the *Ṭabaqāt*. I have adopted the first.

<sup>2</sup> In other words, with promises of helping him to regain the possession of Multān. The *Cambridge History of India* (p. 504) says, that Bahlūl twice set out for Multān, with the object of restoring Shaikh Yūsuf's power, once in 1452 A.D., and again after 1458 A.D.; but he was compelled to return on the first occasion, by the advance of Mahmūd Shāh of Jaunpur, and on the second by the menacing attitude of Husain Shāh also of Jaunpur.

<sup>3</sup> The year is *مشتصد و شصت و پنج* in one MS. In the other the space for the year is left blank. In the lith. ed. of the *Ṭabaqāt* it is 860 A.H., and in the lith. ed. of *Firishtah* it is 874 A.H. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 384) has 874 A.H., 1469 A.D. The *Cambridge History of India* (p. 503) has 861 A.H., 1456 A.D.

<sup>4</sup> قطب الدين لنكاه in the text-edition.



extremely able, and always ready (for all emergencies) and <sup>1</sup> worthy of the descent of divine favours. In the days of his rule the status of learning and wisdom became exalted, and learned and wise men found support from him.

In the beginning of his reign he advanced to the fort of <sup>2</sup> Shōr. They say, that at that time the fort of Shōr was in the possession of Ghāzī Saiyid Khān. When the latter heard that Sultān Husain was coming to attack that country, he made his men ready, sallied out of the fort, and advancing ten *karōhs* engaged Sultān Husain in battle, and after doing justice to his courage and bravery, left the field of battle and turned his face in flight; and without reaching Shōr went towards the town of <sup>3</sup> Behrah. The family and the retainers of Ghāzī who were in Shōr occupied themselves in guarding and strengthening it, and were helping for the arrival of reinforcement from the direction of Behrah and <sup>4</sup> Khānāwāl and Khūshāb, which were in the possession of the Saiyid Khānī *amīrs*. When the siege had lasted for some days, and they became hopeless about the coming of the reinforcements,

<sup>1</sup> The text appears to me to be incorrect and imperfect here. One MS. has *رود الطاف خداوندی بود*, the other has *رود الطاف خداوندی بود*. The lith. ed. has *رود الطاف خوانده بود*. Firishtah lith. ed. has in the corresponding passage *و سزاوار و رود الطاف خداوندی بود*. I think the insertion of the words *و سزاوار* is necessary to complete the meaning; and this has been adopted in the text-edition.

<sup>2</sup> The name is *شور* in the MS., but in one place it looks like *شیر* Shēvur, though later even in that MS. it is Shōr, and in the lith. eds. of the *Ṭabaqāt* and of Firishtah. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 385) calls it Sheevur. The Cambridge History of India (p. 504) calls it Shorkot. The Imperial Gazetteer also calls the *ichsil* and the modern town (which are situated in the Jhang district of the Punjab) Shērkōt; but I doubt whether at the time of Husain Lankāh it was called Shōrkōt. The name was evidently *شور* Shōr or Shūr.

<sup>3</sup> The name is written as *بهره* in both MSS. and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah; and *بهمرا* in the lith. ed. of the *Ṭabaqāt*. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 385) has Bheemra. It is *بهره* in the text-edition.

<sup>4</sup> The name is written as *چنوت* and *جنوت* in the MSS., and *جوت* in the lith. ed. of the *Ṭabaqāt*. The lith. ed. of Firishtah has *چنبرت*. Col. Briggs does not mention the place. I have adopted Khānāwāl which is the name of a place which on the maps is situated ten or eleven miles to the N.E. of Multān. In the text-edition *چنوت* is adopted throughout.



When the standard of the dawn rose in the east of the horizon, they beat the drum of battle, and, going out of the city, <sup>2</sup> stationed themselves so that they might have the Dehli army in front of them. Sultān Ḥusain then ordered all the horsemen to dismount. In the first instance he himself dismounted. Then he ordered that each one of the soldiers should in common concert shoot their arrows at the enemy. When in the first instance twelve thousand arrows leaped at once from the bow strings, great confusion and distress appeared in the enemy's ranks. On the second shot, they separated themselves from one another; and on the third they turned their faces to the desert of flight; <sup>3</sup> and (the fear of the enemy) had in such a way taken possession of their hearts, that when in the course of their flight, they arrived near the fort of Shōr, they did not at all turn towards it; and they did not draw the bridles of their horses, till

<sup>2</sup> The MSS. are incorrect here. One has و سپاه ابی پیش روی خود دادی and the other has و سپاه ابی را در پیش روی خود داده. The lith. ed. of Firishtah has و سپاه دهلی را پیش روی خود کرده. In the text-edition M. Hidayat Hosain has adopted و سپاه آبی را در پیش روی خود کرده.

<sup>3</sup> Here also the MSS. appear to be defective. They have و بطوری حول اشی در دل ایشان Firishtah lith. ed. has و بطوری حول اشی در دل ایشان. دل دشمن جای گرفته بود. راه یافته بود. and not حول seems to be the correct word; but otherwise Firishtah's reading conveys the correct meaning.

they arrived near the town of Khānāwāl. From this <sup>1</sup>defeat (or rather victory), the army of Multān acquired much ammunitions of war and power and prestige.

When Bārbak Shāh and Tātār Khān arrived at the fort of Khānāwāl, they induced the *thānadārs* of Sultān Ḥusain with three hundred other men to come out of the fort by making promises and engagements, but they afterwards treacherously made them food for their swords. Sultān Ḥusain considering this defeat (of his enemies) a great boon, did not allow the intention of recovering Khānāwāl to enter his mind.

At this time Malik Suhrāb Dūdāi, who was the father of Isma‘il Khān and Fath Khān, came from <sup>2</sup>Kach and Mekrān, with their tribesmen and dependants, and joined the service of Sultān Ḥusain. The latter, considering the arrival of Malik Suhrāb a matter of good omen for him, conferred the whole of the country from the fort of Kōt Karōr to the fort of Dhankōt on him and his tribesmen as their *jāgīrs*. After hearing this news many Balūchīs (from Balūchistān) came to the service of Sultān Ḥusain; and the numbers of the latter's adherents increased from day to day. Sultān Ḥusain then made over the remainder of the country situated on the bank of the river Sind, which was well cultivated and populous, to other Balūchīs in lieu of their service. Gradually the whole country from Sītūr to Dhankōt was allotted to the Balūchīs.

It was also at this time that Jām Bāyazīd and Jām Ibrāhīm, who were the chiefs of the tribe of the <sup>3</sup>Thathwas (?), being angry with Jām Nandā, who was the ruler of the country of Sind, entered the service of the Sultān. The particulars of this comprehensive statement are: that the greater part of the country which is situated between Bhakkar and Thatha appertain to the tribe of Thathwa, who consider themselves to be the descendents of Jamshīd; and this tribe was distinguished above all the other tribes for bravery and

<sup>1</sup> The word is شکست in the Ṭabaqāt; and if this word is retained, the word اعدا should be inserted after it. The lith. ed. has افغانان after شکست. Firishtah has فتح victory.

<sup>2</sup> The name is کيج instead of کچ in the text-edition.

<sup>3</sup> The name looks like تهته and سهته in the MSS., and ميسه in the lith. de. of Firishtah. In the text-edition سهته has been adopted.



friendship. As the desire to follow the law of the Prophet and the fear of God were strong in Sultān Sikandar, he agreed to a specific settlement; and it was agreed that the two parties should follow the path of friendliness and attachment, and should be the well-wishers of each other; that the armies of neither should transgress their own frontiers, and whichever of them should be in need of help and assistance, the other should not consider himself excused from granting it. After the treaty had been written, and had been adorned with the signatures of the nobles and the great men of the kingdom, Sultān Sikandar granted robes of honour to the ambassadors, and gave them permission to return.

I do not know the reason of your grief." The Sultān said, "The reason of it is this, that people have attributed the name of *Bādshāh* to me; and I am destitute of the meaning of *Bādshāhī*. And in spite of the fact that I shall rise up with the other *Bādshāhs* on the day of resurrection I shall not be their equal." 'Imād-ul-mulk said, "Let not the heart of the *Bādshāh* be pained and grieved on this account; for the great and holy God has distinguished each kingdom by some special excellence which is held in great respect and honour in other kingdoms. Although the kingdoms of Gujrāt, Deccan, Mālwa and Bengāl are very fertile, and the materials of enjoyments are found there in the best possible way, yet the kingdom of Multān produces *men*; for wherever the great men of Multān went, they were highly respected and honoured. May there be praise and thanks to God! that there are present in Multān some persons belonging to the noble family of the Shaikh-ul-Islām Shaikh Bahā'-ud-dīn Zakariyā, may the mercy of God be on him! who are superior in all noble qualities to Shaikh Yūsuf Quraishī, to whose son Sultān Bahlūl has given his daughter in marriage, and whom he holds in great honour. In the same way there are some persons in Ūch and Multān, belonging to the Bukhārī family, who in bodily and mental perfections are superior to His Holiness Hājī 'Abd-ul-wahāb; and among learned men Maulānā Faṭḥ-ul-lah and his pupil Maulānā 'Azīz-ul-lah have been produced out of the holy earth of Multān. (And these great men are such) that if the entire country of Hindūstān were to pride itself on their account, it would not at all be doing what would be called absurd." When 'Imād-ul-mulk said words like this, the constriction of the heart of the Sultān was changed to expansion.

#### AN ACCOUNT OF SULTĀN FIRŪZ.

When Sultān Ḥusain was overtaken by old age, he in his presence raised his eldest son, who had the name of Firūz Khān on the throne, and gave him the title of Firūz Shāh, and had the public prayers read in his name. He then occupied himself with devotion and the worship of God. The duties of the *razarat* remained confirmed as before on 'Imād-ul-mulk Tawalak. As Sultān Firūz Khān was inexperienced and the emotion of anger was strong in him and dominated over all his other emotions, and as liberality was also wanting in his nature, he

was always envious of <sup>1</sup> Balāl, son of 'Imād-ul-mulk, who was adorned with wisdom and liberality and other accomplishments. On one occasion he said to one of his slaves, who was in his confidence " Balāl has been embezzling the *Bādshāhī* property and wants to create a disturbance, and having got men to combine with him wants to usurp the throne. It befits my state that before the disturbance begin, I should take measures to crush it." The misguided slaves intending to murder Balāl waited for an opportunity. It so happened that one day Balāl went out on a boating excursion, and after the evening prayer was about to return to the city. That slave jumped out of a hiding place, and shot an arrow in his breast; it did not only lodge in the body but passed through it. The innocent and helpless Balāl surrendered his life to the <sup>2</sup> Creator. 'Imād-ul-mulk within a short time caused poison to be administered to Sultān Fīrūz and avenge the murder of his son in the best way. When this calamity happened to the Sultān in his old age, he surrendered his bridle of patience into the hands of groans and lamentations, and wept with many sighs and exclamations of sorrow. In order to guard his kingdom, and avenge the murder of his son, he had the public prayers again read in his own name; and made Mahmūd Khān the son of Sultān Fīrūz his heir; and.



Jām Bāyazīd came to the gate of the palace with his men fully armed and ready (for any emergency). When the news reached the Sultān, he ordered 'Imād-ul-mulk to go and find out the exact facts of the preparations of Jām Bāyazīd's and his retainers. When 'Imād-ul-mulk came before Jām Bāyazīd's troops they immediately seized him, and put him in chains. Sultān Ḥusain made over the duties of the *vazārat* that very hour to Jām Bāyazīd, and added the duties of the guardianship of Maḥmūd Khān, son of Fīrūz Shūh, to those of the *vazārat*. After some days Sultān Ḥusain passed away on account of bodily ailments. His death took place on <sup>1</sup> Sunday, the 6th of the month of Ṣafar in the year 980 A.H., and according to another statement in 940 A.H., and the period of his reign was thirty-four years, and according to another statement 30 years. The writer of this history Nizām-ud-dīn Aḥmad (may there be pardon for him!) submits, that in the accounts by the author of the *Ṭabaqāt-i-Bahādur Shāhī*, two or three errors have occurred in this matter. One is that he has called Sultān Maḥmūd the son of Sultān Ḥusain; and the other is that he has placed the accession of Sultān Fīrūz after that of Sultān Maḥmūd. (As a matter of fact, Sultān Maḥmūd was the son of Sultān Fīrūz, and his accession took place after that of the latter.) Another is that he has described Sultān Fīrūz as the brother of Sultān Maḥmūd, but in fact Sultān Maḥmūd was the son of Sultān Fīrūz, and his accession was after those of Sultān Fīrūz and Sultān Ḥusain.

#### AN ACCOUNT OF SULTĀN MAḤMŪD, SON OF SULTĀN FĪRŪZ.

When Sultān Ḥusain passed away on account of illness (*i.e.*, died a natural death), on the following day, which was <sup>2</sup> Monday the 27th Ṣafar, Jām Bāyazīd, in concert with the nobles and the great men and men of high birth, raised Maḥmūd Khān, in accordance with the directions of Sultān Ḥusain, to the seat of authority, and arranged for his accession. But as he was of immature years he associated

---

<sup>1</sup> One MS. and the lith. ed. have Sunday the 26th Ṣafar, 908 A.H., the other has Saturday the 6th Ṣafar 980 and, according to some, 904. This is incorrect. *Firishtah* lith. ed. has Saturday the 26th Ṣafar 908. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 391) follows *Firishtah*, but makes it Sunday instead of Saturday; and he gives 29th August, 1502, as the date according to the Christian era. The *Cambridge History of India* (p. 504) gives August 31st, 1502, as the date.

<sup>2</sup> This is the date according to both MSS. and the lith. ed. of *Firishtah*.

himself with low people and collected common and vulgar people round him; and his time was spent in jesting and buffoonery. Owing to this great men and men of good lineage kept at a distance from him. When people acquired an ascendancy over him they devoted all their energy to turn his mind against Jām Bāyazīd. In order to gain their object, they made <sup>1</sup> wonderful plans. Jām Bāyazīd on hearing of this, did not come to Multān from the camp which he had established on the bank of the river Chanūb, at a distance of one *farsukh* from Multān; and attended to the affairs of the State at that place; and passed his time in pleasant amusements.

While these things were happening, one day he sent for the headmen of some town, in order to collect revenue from them, and for other matters. As some of the headmen showed some turbulence, Jām Bāyazīd said, "Let the hair on the heads of these men be shaved off, and let them be paraded round the city." The slanderers went to Sulṭān Maḥmūd and told him that Jām Bāyazīd had commenced to punish and to insult even some of the servants of the Sulṭān, that he does not present himself in the *Dīwān* (or the royal court) and sends his son 'Ālam Khān. It is advisable on the score of the Sulṭān's greatness that 'Ālam Khān should be insulted in the Sulṭān's *majlis*, so that there might be a stain on the condition and dignity of the Jām, and he be disgraced and degraded in the eyes of men.

'Ālam Khān was a young man of ability, and was distinguished above the men of his rank for the elegance of his person and of his nature. It so happened that he came one day to offer his respects to Sulṭān Maḥmūd. He was totally unaware that the men who were envious of him had made a plan for humiliating him. When he arrived in the presence of the Sulṭān, one of the courtiers asked him, "What fault had been committed by such and such headmen, that Jām Bāyazīd should have had the hair of their heads shaved off and should otherwise have disgraced them. It would be just that in return for that, the hair of your head should be shaved off." As such words had never before been used to 'Ālam Khān, he protested and

---

<sup>1</sup> The words look like *تفقدان عجب* in one MS.; in the other the adjective is omitted but the other word looks like *لقيفها*. Firishtah lith. ed. has the very simple word *تدبيرها*. In the text-edition it is *قصبا*.

said, "What has come to you, man, that you use such language to me in the *majlis* of the Sultān." He had not yet finished his words when twelve men fell upon him from all sides; and the first thing they did to him was to take off the turban from his head, and then cuffed and kicked him with great violence. At this time 'Ālam Khān with great difficulty drew his dagger from the scabbard and lifted up his hand. By accident the point of the dagger struck the forehead of Sultān Maḥmūd, who, standing at the head of the men who were wrestling together, was amusing himself; and he fell down on the ground groaning and lamenting and bleeding profusely from the wound. The men who had fallen upon 'Ālam Khān now kept their hands off him and turned to the Sultān. 'Ālam Khān, who had received many blows, fled bare-headed for fear of his life. When he reached the gate he found that it was locked; but exerting all his strength he broke the boards of the door and went out and taking a sash from one of his servants, bound it round his head, and proceeded on his way.

When he arrived in the presence of the Jām Bāyazīd and explained what had happened, the Jām said, "Oh my son, what you have done has become the cause of (our) shame in both the worlds; but as it is not possible to remedy it now, go to Shōr with all quickness, and send the whole of the army with all despatch; so that before Sultān Maḥmūd should have collected all his troops, I may send all my men to Shōr." He sent 'Ālam Khān immediately to Shōr, and when his army arrived from there, he struck the drum for the march, and started for Shōr.

Sultān Maḥmūd on hearing this news nominated some of the *amīrs* to pursue him. When the two armies approached each other, Jām Bāyazīd turned round, and took up a position and the war-like men belonging to the two armies went forward and fought bravely with each other. In the end, Jām Bāyazīd defeated the Sultān's army, and proceeded towards Shōr. When he arrived there, he had the public prayers read, and the coins struck, in the name of Sultān Sikandar, son of Bahlūl; and explaining all that had happened in a petition, sent it to him. The latter sent a *farmān* of encouragement, and a robe of honour to Jām Bāyazīd; and wrote another *farmān* to Daulat Khān Lūdī, who was the governor of the Punjāb to the effect, that "As Jām Bāyazīd has appealed to me for protection, and has read the public prayers in my name, it behoves you that you

should make yourself acquainted with all the circumstances, and should not hold yourself excused from helping and assisting him; and whenever he should be in need of any reinforcement, you should go yourself to give it to him."

After some days, Sultān Maḥmūd collected all his army, and advanced towards Shōr. Jām Bāyazīd and 'Ālam Khān, in concert with their men, came out of Shōr, and met them at a distance of ten *karōhs* from that place, and encamped with the river Rāwī in front of him. Jām Bāyazīd also sent a letter to Daulat Khān Lūdī, and notified him with what had happened. No battle had yet taken place between the armies of Sultān Maḥmūd and Jām Bāyazīd, when Daulat Khān came with the army of the Punjāb to reinforce Jām Bāyazīd; and sending men, in whom he had confidence, to wait on Sultān Maḥmūd began negotiations for an amicable settlement; and in the end through his exertions a settlement was effected on the basis of the river Rāwī being recognized as the boundary between the territories of the two parties; and neither party transgressing it. Daulat Khān Lūdī then sent Sultān Maḥmūd to Multān, and escorted Jām Bāyazīd to Shōr and from there he went back to Lāhōre. But in spite of the fact, that a man like Daulat Khān Lūdī had intervened to effect the peace, it did not have any stability.

About this time <sup>1</sup> Mir Jākar Zand came to Multān from the direction of <sup>2</sup> Sēwī with his two sons Mir <sup>3</sup> Allahdād and Mir Shahdād. Mir <sup>4</sup> Shahdād was the first man who promulgated the Shī'a religion in Multān. As Malik Suhrāb Dūdāi was held in great honour by the

<sup>1</sup> The name looks like *میر جا گردند* Mir Jākar Dand or Zand in one MS.; and *میر جا کر دوزید* Bar Jākar Dūzid in the other. In the lith. ed. of *Firishtah* the name looks like *میر عماد کرویزی* Mir 'Imād Karwizi. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 396) has Meer Jakur Zund, and he says in a footnote that the name Jakur occurs among the early Suljook Toorks. It is *میر جا کراند* in the text-edition.

<sup>2</sup> The name is *سوی* in both MSS. It is *سولی* in the lith. ed. of *Firishtah*, and Solypoor in Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 396).

<sup>3</sup> The names are *الله داد* and *میر الله داد* or *میر شهداد* in the two MSS. *Firishtah* lith. ed. has what looks like *مرزا شهید* and *مرزا شهدا*. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 396) calls them Meer Sheheed and Meer Shahida.

<sup>4</sup> *Firishtah* takes exception to this statement of Nizām-ud-dīn, and says that the latter does not say who Mir 'Imād was, and whence he came, etc.

*Lankāhs*, Mīr Jākar Zand could not remain there; and sought an asylum with Jām Bāyazīd. As he was the head of a clan, Jām Bāyazīd received him with much honour, and bestowed on him and his sons a part of the territory which was in the *Khālṣa* or crown land.

Jām Bāyazīd was a man of high moral character and of a generous disposition; and showed much kindness to learned men and was generous to the men of piety. They say that at the time of the hostility (between Sultān Maḥmūd and himself), he sent gifts and arms to learned and pious men by boats from Shōr to Multān, and one after another many favours were shown by him to the great men of Multān. Many wise men leaving their birthplace took up their residence in Shōr, and he summoned a number of them with much eagerness. Among them he prayed His Holiness Maulānā ‘Azīz-ul-lah, who was a disciple of Maulānā Faṭḥ-ul-lah, with great solicitude to come to Shōr. When the latter arrived near Shōr, he met him with great respect, and bringing him with great honour into the city, took him with great courtesy to his own harem; and ordered his own servants that they should pour water over his hands, and he also directed that they should pour that water at the four corners of the house, for the sake of the good fortune which it would bring to it.

A wonderful story has been told of Shaikh Jalāl-ud-dīn Quraishī who was the *vakīl* (minister) of Jām Bāyazīd, which, though it has no bearing on the subject matter (of this history), but, on account of its miraculous nature and to guard it from the evil of neglect, is being written down here with the pen of musk-like fragrant writing. They narrate that when His Holiness Maulānā ‘Azīz-ul-lah came to Shōr and was received with great respect and honour, greater than what the men of the age had expected, from Jām Bāyazīd and the latter took him into his own harem, and ordered the maid-servants to wait on him. Shaikh Jalāl-ud-dīn Quraishī sent a man to wait on the Maulānā with the message that the Jām Bāyazīd sends his prayers (for the Maulānā’s well-being), and his object in ordering the maids to attend before him was this that as he had come unattended by any one, if he would notify whichever of them finds favour in his eyes, she would be sent to serve him. The Maulānā sent a verbal reply to the effect that “God forbid! that any man should cast an evil eye on the maids in the service of his friend; and besides the age and years of this *faqīr* do not agree with such an insinuation.” When the servant

of Maulānā 'Azīz-ul-lah went and gave the message to Jām Bāyazīd, the latter said, "I have no knowledge whatever of such a message." The Maulānā was ashamed, and said, "May the neck of the man who has done this thing be broken"; and without going to see the Jām he took his way to his own house; and before the news could reach the Jām, he had passed beyond the boundary of the latter's territory. In the end, it came to pass as had been said by the Maulānā, for when Shaikh Jalāl-ud-dīn returned from the service of Sultān Sikandar, and came to Shōr, one night his foot slipped, when he was on the terrace (of his house), he fell on his head, and his neck was broken.

When His Majesty Firdūs Makānī Zahir-ud-dīn Bābar Bādshāh Ghāzi took possession of the Punjāb in the year 930 A.H., and marched towards Delhi, he sent a *farmān* to Mīrzā Shāh Husain Arghūn, the ruler of Thatha, that he had bestowed Multān and the neighbouring territory on him. Mīrzā Shāh Husain Arghūn crossed the river near the fort of Bhakkar; and the blast of the wrath of the God began to blow and inundation of arrogance began to flow. Sultān Maḥmūd on hearing this news trembled for fear, and collected his troops, and coming two stages out of the city of Multān, sent Shaikh Bahā'-ud-dīn Quraishī, who was the successor of the Shaikh-ul-Islām Shaikh Bahā'-ud-dīn Zakariya, may his soul be sanctified! as his ambassador to Mīrzā Shāh Husain; and he made Maulānā Bahlūl, who in the beauty of his diction and in the expression of his meaning was far in advance of the age, to be the assistant of Shaikh Bahā'-ud-dīn. When the latter arrived in the camp of Mīrzā Shāh Husain, the latter treated them with courtesy and respect; and after the former had performed his duties as ambassador, Mīrzā Shāh Husain said in reply, "My object in coming was to look after the training of Sultān Maḥmūd and for making a pilgrimage to the tomb of Shaikh Bahā'-ud-dīn." Maulānā Bahlūl said, "What would happen, if the training of Sultān Maḥmūd should be left to His Holiness the asylum of the Prophetship, may the benediction of God be on him and on his descendants! for he has given him the necessary spiritual training; and as to the second matter Shaikh Bahā'-ud-dīn has himself come to attend on you, and what necessity is there for your taking further trouble in the matter." When Shaikh Bahā'-ud-dīn came back to Sultān Maḥmūd, the latter died the next night of an attack of colic. The surmise of some men was, that Langar Khān, who was a slave of the dynasty, had

administered poison to him. His death took place in 931 A.H.; and the period of his rule was twenty-seven years.

#### AN ACCOUNT OF SULTĀN ḤUSAIN, SON OF SULTĀN MAḤMŪD.

When Sultān Maḥmūd had passed away, Qawām Khān Lankāh and Langar Khān, who were the commanders of Sultān Maḥmūd's army, took the path of flight and joined Mīrzā Shāh Ḥusain. They received such favours as their hearts wished for, and brought the towns (appertaining) to Multān under the rule of the Mīrzā. The rest of the *amīrs* of the Lankāh tribe, being discomfited, returned to Multān. There they gave Sultān Ḥusain, son of Sultān Maḥmūd, who had not yet passed the age of infancy, the title of Sultān Ḥusain; and read the public prayers in his name. Although they gave the name of Sultān to him, yet Shaikh Shujā'-ul-mulk Bukhārī, who was the son-in-law of Sultān Maḥmūd, assumed the name of *vazīr*, and took upon himself the administration of all matters of State. He was, however, without any experience, and although they did not have provisions sufficient for even one month in the fort of Multān he decided on defending it. Mīrzā Shāh Ḥusain considering the death of Sultān Maḥmūd the means of his conquering Multān gave the people of the city no time for preparation for defence; and galloped in, and laid siege to the fort. When the siege had lasted for some days, the soldiers distressed by hunger, came to Shaikh Shujā'-ul-mulk,<sup>1</sup> who was the minister responsible for the ruin of the country of Multān, and said to him, "Our horses are yet fresh, and we find the strength of fighting in ourselves. It is better, that having divided the troops, we should advance to the field of battle. It may be that the breeze of victory and triumph would blow on us. The other alternative is to guard the fort in the hope of reinforcement and help; but there is

---

<sup>1</sup> The readings are different. One MS. has *که عمده خرابی ولایت ازو بود*, while the other has *که عمده ولایت ملتان از پیش او بوده*. Firishtah in the corresponding passage has *که عمده خرابی ملک از پیش او بود*. None of the readings is quite clear. The word *عمده*, one of the meanings of which is a minister, is the stumbling block. The reading of the first MS. and of Firishtah may mean: who was the minister who was responsible for the ruin of the country; and I have adopted this reading. In the text-edition the passage reads *که عمداً خرابی ولایت ملتان از پیش او بوده*.

no such hope from any side." Shaikh Shujā'-ul-mulk gave them no reply at the interview; but he summoned some of the trusted leaders to a private conference, and said, "The rule of Sultān Ḥusain has not yet acquired any strength or stability. If we go out of the city with the determination to fight, there is a very strong likelihood that most of the men would, in the hope of obtaining favour from Mīrzā Shāh Ḥusain, go to him and render him homage; and the few who are bound by a sense of honour, would stand firmly in that field of battle, and would be slain."

<sup>1</sup> It is related that Maulānā Sa'd-ul-lah Lāhōrī, who was one of the wise men of the age, said, "I was at that time in the citadel of Multān. When the siege had gone on for some months, the troops of Mīrzā Ḥusain shut up all the entrances and exits in such a way that no one could send any help to the garrison from outside and nobody going out of the fort could betake himself to a nook or corner of safety. Gradually the subsistence and the life of the men in the garrison were reduced to such straits, that if by accident, a cat or a dog fell into their hands, they devoured its flesh like that of a kid or lamb. Shaikh Shujā'-ul-mulk appointed a <sup>2</sup> *pījī* of the name of Jādū to be a commander of three thousand infantry men of the town and nominated him to be the defender of the fort. That misguided man went to the house of any poor man, who he imagined had any grain in his possession, and without any enquiry plundered it. Owing to these improper acts of his, men raised their hands in prayer and according

<sup>1</sup> The MSS. say here مولانا سعد الله لاهوری کہ از اتمثل وقت بود عیقلت and then go on to say, what he said had happened during the siege. This cannot be correct, as the siege was yet going on, and the incidents mentioned by the Maulānā had not yet happened. I have accordingly substituted what is written in the lith. ed. of *Firishtah*, in which what the Maulānā had said has been recorded as a matter of tradition. The name of the Maulānā is Sa'd-ud-din in the lith. ed. of *Firishtah*. I have, however, retained the name of Sa'd-ul-lah, as that is also the name given by Col. Briggs. The text-edition has followed the MSS.

<sup>2</sup> There are some differences in the readings. One MS. calls the man جادو نام باجی while the other has جادو نام پاچی and *Firishtah* lith. ed. has جادا نام باجی. Then one MS. has by mistake سرداری سرکار پیاده قصباتی instead of سرداری سه هزار پیاده قصباتی as in the other MS. and in the lith. ed. of both the *Tabaqāt* and the *Firishtah*.

In the text-edition it is جادا نام پاچی instead of جادو نام باجی.



to the purport of the saying that : any change is for the better though it may involve our loss, prayed for the ruin of Shujā'-ul-mulk. In the end <sup>1</sup> men having considered their being slain easier, threw themselves from the ramparts into the ditch below; and Mīrzā Shāh Ḥusain having become aware of the terrible distress of the men in the fort, stopped his men from slaying them. After this when the siege had been prolonged for a year and some months, one night towards morning the servants of the Mīrzā entered the fort, and stretching out the hand of rapine from the sleeve of oppression began to slay and devastate. The residents of the city from the age of seven to that of seventy years, who escaped the sword, were taken into slavery; and every one against whom there was a suspicion of his having any gold, suffered much insult and torture. This calamity occurred about the end of the year 932 A.H."

Maulānā Sa'd-ul-lah has narrated the following about himself, "When the citadel was taken by the Arghūns, a number of men entered our house; and at first a man seized my father, who bore the name of Maulānā Ibrāhīm Jāma', and who seated on the *masnad* or carpet of teaching had for five and sixty years given lessons in various branches of learning; and had towards the end of his life become blind, and began to treat him with insult and contumely. Others came in, and suspecting from the cleanliness of the house, and the elegance of the buildings that the inmates were wealthy people, one of them seized me as a captive. It so happened that that man took me as a present to the *vazīr* of the Mīrzā; and it also so happened, that the *vazīr* was seated at that time in the courtyard of a house on a wooden seat. He gave orders, in compliance with which the man put a chain on my feet and tied the end of it strongly to a leg of the *vazīr's* seat. The tears were flowing freely from my eyes, and I was weeping chiefly on account of the condition of my father. After a little while the *vazīr* sent for a <sup>2</sup> receptacle for pens, etc., and after mending his pen

<sup>1</sup> Firishtah explains that as everyone who attempted to go out by the gate was killed by the besiegers, the men in the garrison threw themselves from the ramparts.

<sup>2</sup> The word looks like *مجرة* in one MS. and in the lith. eds. of the Ṭabaqāt and Firishtah, but it is *قلمدان* in the other MS. In the text-edition M. Hidayat Hosain has used the right word *مخبرة*, which is a synonym for *قلمدان*.

wanted to write something. <sup>1</sup> At that time it entered his mind that he should again perform his ablutions, and then begin to write. He got up and went to a place for easing nature. As there was no one in the house I drew myself close to the seat, and wrote down this couplet from the *Qasida* <sup>2</sup> *Burda* 'What has happened to your eyes, that when I ask them to stop weeping they start weeping more vehemently than before? What is wrong with your heart that when I order it to be calm, it gets more excited?' on a piece of paper, which the *vazīr* had brought out for writing on. Then I dragged myself back <sup>3</sup> to my own place and tears went on flowing from my eyes. After a little time when the *vazīr* again sat down in his place and wanted to write something on the paper, he saw that a couplet was written on it. He looked round on all sides of the place. As he saw no one there, he turned to me and said, 'Did you write this?' I said, 'Yes.' Then he asked me about my circumstances. When I told him my father's name, he got up, and removed the chain from my feet, and put his own dress on me; and immediately mounting his horse, went to the audience hall of the *Mirzā*, and placed me before the latter's eyes; and spoke

the trouble of accompanying him; and he ordered his officers that whatever the Maulānā should have lost should be restored to him; and if the whole of it could not be found the price of that portion should be paid to him. My father said to him in reply, 'The days of life have come to an end. It is now time for my undertaking the journey to the other world and not of accompanying you'; and in the end what my father had said, came to pass; for after two months he was united with the proximity of the mercy of God."

In short, when the citadel of Multān was captured, Mirzā Shāh Husain made over Sulṭān Husain to the guards; and treated Shaikh Shujā-ul-mulk Bukhārī with much contumacy; and extorted large sums of money from him, <sup>2</sup>till he came to an end in this matter. When the ruin and desolation of Multān reached a point, that no one could even think that it would again become populous and flourishing, the Mirzā, considering the further administration of the affairs of Multān an easy matter, left a man of the name of Khwājah Shams-ud-dīn to guard it, and making Langer Khān his assistant returned towards Thatta. Langer Khān having encouraged men from all places again restored Multān. He combined with the people of the place and removed Khwājah Shams-ud-dīn <sup>3</sup>bodily and took independent possession of the place.

When His Majesty Firdūs Makānī departed from the world, and the position of the Sulṭān of the great country of Hindūstān devolved on his Majesty Jinnat Aṣṭānī, the latter made over the country of the Panjāb to Mirzā Kamrān as his *jāgīr*. The latter sent some of his men and summoned Langer Khān to wait upon him. When the latter arrived at Lāhore, and was honoured by being allowed to wait on Mirzā Kamrān, the latter bestowed the territory of Bābal <sup>4</sup>

---

on him, in exchange for Multān. He also appointed a place at the extreme end of the inhabited part of Lāhōre for the residence of Langar Khān. This place is now known as the *Dāi'rah* of Langar Khān, and has become one of the residential areas of the city of Lāhōre. From this time Multān again came into the possession of the Sultāns at Dehlī. After the death of Mirzā Kāmran it descended to Shēr Khān and from him to Salīm Khān, and from them to the agents and servants of His Majesty the Khalifa-i-Ilāhī, as each of these has been mentioned in its proper place.

*A final statement.*—In a description of the countries ruled over by the servants of His Majesty, let it not remain concealed, that the length of the country, which is to-day in the possession of this powerful State, from Hindū Kōh on the borders of Badakhshān to the country of Orissa, which on the further side of Bengāl, from the west to the east is one thousand and two hundred Akbar Shāhī *karōls* by the *Hīzī* yard measure, which is equal to one thousand six hundred and eighty *karōls Shara'i*; and its breadth from Ka-shmīr to the <sup>2</sup> hills of Barīsh, which are at the extreme limit of the country of Sōrath and Gujrat is eight hundred *karōls Ilāhī*; another breadth from the

---

contained in this brief account the particulars of the city will be given and <sup>1</sup> will be written in alphabetical order, if the Great God so wills.

---

<sup>1</sup> The sentence as given in the text is what it is in one MS. In the other MS. instead of خواهد شد it has شد ; and then تمت تمام شد تواریخ کذاب اکبر شاعی and after that بعون ملک الوهاب عز اسمه which may be translated: Finish. Here is finished the history book *Tabaqāt-i-Akbar Shāhī*, by the help of the Lord of all gifts, may His name be honoured!

(END)

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ABDUL HAK AMID—The *Riāḡu-s-Sal-āfin* of Ghulām-i-Ḥusain Salim. Persian text. (Calcutta, 1890-1898).
- 'ABDUL WALI—The Bahmani Dynasty. *Journ. Asiat. Soc. Bengal*, (N.S.) V, p. 463 (1910).
- 'ABDUL WALI—The Spelling of Bābur's Name. *Journ. Asiat. Soc. Bengal*, (N.S.) XIV, pp. 453-455, 1919.
- ABDUS SALAM—*Riāḡu-s-Salāfin*—A History of Bengal by Ghulam Ḥusain Salim. English translation. (Calcutta, 1902-04).
- ABŪ TURĀN VAH (MIR)—*A History of Gujarat*. Edited with introduction and notes by E. Dennison Ross. (Calcutta, 1909).
- AḤMAD 'ALĪ and 'ABDŪ'R-RAHĪM—*Akbar-nāma* by Abū'l-Faḍl 'Allāmī. Persian text. (Calcutta, 1873-86).
- BAYLEY, E. C.—History of Gujarāt. (The Local Muhammadan Dynasties). (London, 1886).
- BEALY, THOS. WILLIAM—Oriental Biographical Dictionary. (Calcutta, 1881).
- BEVERIDGE, A. S.—The Bābur-nāma in English (Memoirs of Bābur). Vols. I and II. (London, 1921).
- BRATTASALI, N. K.—*Coins and Chronology of the Early Independent Sultāns of Bengal*, pp. i-vii, 1-184. (Dacca, Cambridge, 1922).
- BLOCHMANN, H.—Contributions to the Geography and History of Bengal (Muhammadan Period). *Journ. Asiat. Soc. Bengal*, XLII, pt. i, pp. 209-310 (1873).
- BURGES, J.—History of the Rise of the Mahomedan Power in India till the year A.D. 1612. Translated from the original Persian of Mahomed Kasim Ferishta, Vols. I-IV. (London, 1829).
- BROCKELMANN, CARL—Geschichte der Arabischen Litteratur, Vol. I. (Weimar, 1898).
- CORNINGTON, O.—Coins of the Bahmani Dynasty. *Numismatic Chronicle*, 3rd Ser., Vol. XVIII.
- DAMES, MANSIE LONGWORTH—The Book of Duarte Barbosa, Vols. 1 and 2. *Hall. Soc.*, 1918, 1921.
- DE, B.—*Ṭabaqāt-i-Akbari* by Khwājāh Nizāmuddīn Aḥmad. Persian text, Vols. I, II. (Calcutta, 1913-27, 1931). English translation, Vols. I, II. (1927, 1930).
- DE, B. and M. HIDAYAT HOSAIN—*Ṭabaqāt-i-Akbari* by Khwājāh Nizāmuddīn Aḥmad. Persian text, Vol. III. (Calcutta, 1935).
- DUFF, JAMES GRANT—History of the Mahrattas. (London, 1873; Calcutta, 1912).
- ELPHINSTONE, M.—The History of India—The Hindu and Mahometan Periods. 7th edition with notes and additions by E. B. Cowell. (London, 1889).
- ELIAS, N. and ROSS, E. D.—The Tarikh-i-Rashidi—A History of the Moghuls of Central Asia. (London, 1895).
- ELLIOT, H. M.—History of India as told by its historians. Edited by John Dowson, 8 vols. (London, 1867-77).

- FORBES, A. K.—*Rās Mālā*, or Hindoo Annals of the Province of Goosarat in Western India, 2 vols. (London, 1856).
- HAIG, T. W.—The Chronology and the Genealogy of the Muhammadan Kings of Kashmīr. *Journ. Roy. Asiat. Soc.*, pp. 451–468 and a table (1918).
- HAIG, T. W.—Some Notes on the Bahmani Dynasty. *Journ. Asiat. Soc. Bengal*, 1904, Part I, Extra No., pp. 1–15.
- HAIG, T. W.—The Muntakhab-al-Lubāb of Khāfi Khān. Persian text, Vol. III. (Calcutta, 1925).
- HAIG, WOLSELEY (SIR)—*The Cambridge History of India*, Vol. III, Turks and Afghans. (Cambridge, 1928).
- ILĀHDĀD, M.—Zafar-nāma by Sharafu'd-Dīn 'Alī Yazdī. Persian text. (Calcutta, 1885–88).
- The Imperial Gazetteer of India*, Vol. XII. Einme to Gwalior. (Oxford, 1908).
- The Imperial Gazetteer of India*, Vol. XXII, Samadhīālā to Singhāna. (Oxford, 1908).
- JARRETT, H. S.—*The Ain-i-Akbarī*, by Abul Fazal-Allāmī. Translation, Vol. III. (Calcutta, 1894).
- KHWĀJAH NIZAMUDDIN AHMAD—*Tabaqāt-i-Akbarī*. Persian text. Lithograph edition, Newal Kishore Press. (Lucknow, 1875).
- KING, MAJOR J. S.—History of the Bahmani Dynasty. *Ind. Antiquary*, 1899.
- LANE-POOLE, S.—The Mohammadan Dynasties—Chronological and Genealogical tables with historical introductions. (London, 1925).
- LEES, W. N., KABIRU'D-DIN AHMAD and AHMAD 'ALĪ—Muntakhab al-tawārikh by 'Abdu'l-Qādir Badāunī. Persian text. (Calcutta, 1864–69).
- LEES, W. N., S. AHMAD KHĀN and KABIR AL-DIN—Tārīkh-i Feroz-shāhī by Zia al-Dīn Barnī. Persian text. (Calcutta, 1860–62).
- MAHLER, E.—Wüstenfeld-Mahler'sche Vergleichungs-Tabellen der mohamedanischen und Christlichen Zeitrechnung. (Leipzig, 1926).
- MUIR, SIR WILLIAM—Annals of the Early Caliphate from original sources. (London, 1853).
- The Rāja Taranginī*; A History of Cashmīr; consisting of four separate compilations:—
- (i) The Rāja Taranginī, by Kalhana Pandita, 1148 A.D.,
  - (ii) Rājāvalī, by Jona Rāja (defecture), to 1412 A.D.,
  - (iii) Continuation of Same, by Srivara Pandita, 1477 A.D.,
  - (iv) The Rājāvalī Pāṭaka, by Prājya Bhaṭṭa, brought up to the conquest of the valley by the Emperor Akber. (Calcutta, 1835).
- RAVERTY, H. G.—The Mīhrān of Sind and its tributaries, a Geographical and Historical Study. *Journ. Asiat. Soc. Bengal*, LXI, pt. i, pp. 155–508, 9 plates. (1892–93).
- RODGERS, C. J.—The square silver coins of the Sultāns of Kashmīr. *Journ. Asiat. Soc. Bengal*, LIV, pt. i, pp. 92–139, 3 pls. (1855).
- SCOTT, J.—*History of Decan*. (London, 1794).
- SEWELL, R.—A Forgotten Empire (Vijayanagar). (London, 1909).
- SEWELL, ROBERT and DIESIT, S. B.—Indian Calendar. (London, 1896).
- STEIN, SIR AUREL—Kalhana's Rājataranginī, Vols. I, II. (Westminster, 1909).
- STEWART, C.—*The History of Bengal*. (London, 1813).

*Tārīkh Firishdah.* Persian text. Lithograph edition, Nowal Kishore Press, Vols. I, II. (Lucknow, 1884).

THOMAS, E.—The chronicles of the Pathān Kings of Delhi. (London, 1871).

TOPE, J.—Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan of the Central and Western Rajpoot States. Vols. I, II. Second edition. (Calcutta, 1877-1879).

VILĀYAT HUSAIN—*Tārīkh-i-Firozshāhī* by Shams-i-Sirāj Afif. (Persian text). (Calcutta, 1888-91).

---